‘We just have to get on with it’: Inclusive teaching in a standards driven system

Zeta Brown

PhD thesis

Director of Studies: Dr Neil Duncan

Supervisor: Prof Ken Manktelow

Abstract

Q-methodology was used alongside semi-structured interviews with primary school teachers to explore their positions on two key areas of education ideology: inclusive schools and standards in education. The study explored in depth the views of 26 teachers in 6 schools, selected through purposive sampling to give a range of individual and institutional demographics. Key statements were compiled from the literature that offered a wide spectrum of personal and professional positions on the two issues of standards and inclusion in education. These statements were produced as sets of cards for participants to arrange in order of strength of agreement or disagreement. The results were factor-analysed via Q-method software to render visible factors of items that had statistical significance for the participants (Brown 1997). These factors were then interpreted in the light of subsequent semi-structured interviews and returned to the participants for discussion. The study found that teachers developed their own 'practical' notion of inclusion, in which specialist systems, such as p-scales, are needed for the inclusion of children with Special Educational Needs (SEN). These teachers held contrasting views on whether they felt constraints or experienced flexibility when implementing the strict standards objectives. Crucially, in considering the agendas simultaneously, these teachers suggested that the practical implementation of the inclusion and standards agendas is as disparate as their objectives. The agendas are seen as separate entities, with standards assuming an apparent dominance, ensuring that the inclusion agenda is implemented within a standards driven system.

Contents page

Acknowledgements

I have been on an incredible journey during my doctorate. I feel I have not only developed as an academic but as a person. I am fortunate to have around me a family and close friends who have continuously supported me through this process. My daughter, Mia has grown from a baby to a child as I have studied; I would like to thank her for being such a model child and allowing me to study alongside being her mum. My husband, Christopher has always believed in my capabilities and has supported my dedication to my doctorate. For this I thank him dearly.

Additionally, I am very lucky that my immediate family and my husband's family have supported my studies by being there to listen and offer advice. In particular I have to thank my mother, who during my childhood read many, many books to me and encouraged me to seek my full potential. My father has also helped me financially with my studies and without this support my dreams of completing a PhD would have remained an aspiration. I also need to give a special thank you to my mother-in law and to Mia's godmother, Di, for their baby-sitting support, mostly at short notice.

Finally, I have been fortunate throughout my doctorate to have great communication and support from my supervisory team. I would like to thank Dr Neil Duncan and Prof. Ken Manktelow for the advice and guidance that provided me with the confidence and skills to write my thesis.

Introduction

This thesis examines how teachers regard their work in relation to two important aspects of schooling, inclusive education and pupil achievement, which have been key themes in government discourses on education in recent decades. Inclusion and the drive to raise standards in terms of pupil achievement continue to be government agendas, but present certain tensions in their simultaneous delivery. This thesis looks at how primary school teachers position themselves in implementing these two agendas simultaneously.

I have used the term 'positions' rather than 'perspectives' or 'attitudes' in this thesis because it conveys the idea of taking up a stance on something. My use of the term 'positions' developed as I discovered the complexity of teachers' positions *vis-à-vis* the inclusion and standards agendas. The use of Q-methodology in this research further emphasised the importance of positionality. Q-methodology was originally developed for use in psychological research and explores the complexity in participants' positions using subjectivity. As a methodology, researchers from different fields can use Q according to their positions as researchers. In this research I had continually to consider my sociological position as a researcher when designing how I was going to use Q. In analysing Q data, terms such as opinion, view and perspective seemed to limit this complexity, whereas I found that teachers' positions on these agendas were subject to multiple influences, including past experiences, present circumstances or future endeavours.

Throughout the thesis I also refer to 'agendas' but they might also be called 'ideologies', 'philosophies' or 'discourses'. They are not simply philosophies in the abstract sense, as their implementation in the classroom and their reinforcement by legal statute testifies; my use of the term 'agendas' tries to acknowledge this duality in the sense of an agenda almost as 'a list of things to get through'.

This research has developed from my undergraduate dissertation in which I investigated teachers' positions on the inclusion agenda. I found it very interesting that teachers' responses to my questions were centred on children with Special Educational Needs (SEN) and did not refer to any elements of the standards agenda. From my personal standpoint on

inclusion I was interested in exploring how key standards processes, such as the National Curriculum and Statutory Assessment Tests (SATs), could be applied using inclusive practice as I understood it. The inclusion agenda promotes diversity and equality and values difference from a human rights perspective (Nutbrown and Clough 2006). The standards agenda promotes opportunity for all, emphasising academic achievement through the measurement of success of children, teachers and schools (George and Clay 2008). However, not all children can be included in the SAT process and pupils who do not attain the national average can be seen as failing in their education. However, if the standards agenda really promoted opportunity for all, it would include all children covered in the inclusion agenda and if the standards agenda was wholly inclusive all children would be able to participate fully in it. Overlapping the objectives of these two education agendas exposes a conflict in the theoretical objectives that may have an impact on their combined practical implementation. My research questions are:

(1) What are primary teachers' positions on the inclusive education agenda?
(2) What are primary teachers' positions on the education standards agenda?
(3) How do primary teachers manage these agendas simultaneously?

These research questions enabled me to investigate thoroughly teachers' positions on these two education agendas separately and then in tandem. This is an important aspect of this research as, in order to embrace fully teachers' complex positions on these agendas I needed to explore whether the participants had different positions on them when considering them separately, as well as simultaneously. By considering these positions in depth, I have been able to provide contributions to knowledge of teachers' positions on inclusion, standards and the practical combination of the two.

I had originally expected to use wholly qualitative methods for this study but, following my degree dissertation, I carried out some voluntary work in the same primary school on which I had based that work. In conversation with teachers at the school about the possible conflict between 'driving up standards' and 'valuing all', I felt that they were telling me what they thought I wanted to hear or at least what they thought their schools would want me to hear. For instance, teachers explained the school's objectives in relation to inclusive practice, rather than stating their own positions. Coming from a mainly sociological tradition, I explored numerous ways in which I could ascertain their thinking about this subject through

interviews but eventually felt that I needed to augment my proposed doctoral methodology with another data collection instrument.

After lengthy evaluation of an array of different approaches I was introduced to Q-methodology. I was intrigued by Q-methodology's claims to be a means of studying subjectivity, providing a 'scientific instrument' that has the qualitative dimension with which I had a strong affinity while also producing rigorous numerical data (Brown 1996) from a small number of participants. Having learned more about this interesting but comparatively little-used methodology, I decided to use Q alongside semi-structured interviews.

The thesis proposes a number of different contributions to knowledge in both research findings and methodological design. Among these are

- Research findings indicate contributions to knowledge of teachers' positions on the inclusion and standards agendas separately as well as considering their practical implementation in tandem.
- The Q method was developed in innovative ways as a unique design, suited to this research problem, that does not appear in any other published Q work in that:
    i. a single Q set was created that would fit two conditions of instruction
    ii. the use of post-Q sort semi-structured interviews using factor statement prompts gathered important qualitative data and triangulated over time-points
    iii. the combined analysis of the inclusion and standards Q sets in considering the agendas simultaneously was developed for this research

My literature review has been divided into three chapters; the first two consider the implementation of the inclusion and standards agendas from two different perspectives, beginning with an historical review and followed by a more political account. The third chapter discusses teachers' identity and research on societal perspectives of their profession. It incorporates a social psychology element and explores Festinger's (1967) theory of cognitive dissonance in considering the complexity involved in individual positions and the social influences that may have an impact on them.

The methodology chapter contains a reflective account of my journey through the investigation of different research methods and to a final decision about the Q-method.

Following this decision, I had to consider the implications of it being a methodology rather than simply a data collection method, as this had implications for the whole concept of the study. These decisions were particularly difficult in the early stages of my research but I always found comfort in revisiting my position as a researcher. Influenced by academics such as Brown (1996), I adopted a qualitative stance to the use of Q and decided to use post Q-sort semi-structured interviews to complement this approach. This chapter goes on to present the justifications for my choices and describe how I developed my sequence of research methods.

Thereafter I offer a series of chapters summarising my findings. I had an abundance of data from both my Q-sort and post Q-sort semi-structured interviews which I used to develop findings. I used a systematic approach to detailing these findings in order to avoid losing the detail. I developed separate chapters to answer each of my research questions, focusing initially on the inclusion agenda, then the standards agenda. I started work on research questions one and two 'what are primary teachers' positions on the inclusive education agenda?' and 'what are primary teachers' positions on the education standards agenda?' by analysing the Q-sort data alone, both statistically and qualitatively. I then analysed each individual Q-sort; each report completed at the time of the Q-sort and the post Q-sort semi-structured interview data in association with the specified research question. In the section presenting findings for research question three, 'how do primary teachers manage these agendas simultaneously?', the Q data for both the inclusion and standards agendas were re-analysed together to develop factors combining teachers' positions on both agendas. Thereafter, further qualitative findings are discussed specifically in reference to research question three.

The final chapter of this thesis offers recommendations for future research.

Literature review – Socio-historical perspective

Whilst there are strong cultural and legislative similarities influencing the professional conduct of primary school teachers across the United Kingdom, there are some important differences in teacher autonomy and curricula between England, Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland. The differentiation has been increasingly important since the devolution of power to the Scottish and Welsh assemblies during the first New Labour administration. The present study focuses on the situation in England during the years 1944-2013, however policies implemented in England can have repercussions for policy in the rest of the UK.

The significance of the 1944 Education Act in the initial development of the standards and inclusion agendas

The Education Act (1944) enshrined objectives that eventually led to the development of the standards and inclusion agendas (Strain and Simkins 2008; Thomas and Vaughan 2004). At the time of its implementation the school system had seen comparatively little centralised control by government and teachers had a significant amount of autonomy in their actions (Strain and Simkins 2008). In fact, there was little statutory control of primary schools and teachers could design their own curricula, with the exception of the mandatory inclusion of religious education (Watkins 1993). However, Local Education Authorities (LEAs) had considerable influence over curriculum development (Wyse and Torrance 2009). The Education Act (1944), also known as the Butler Act, sought to change the system, providing more centralised control and, at the same time, attempting to integrate those we now refer to as disabled children into mainstream settings. In order to increase government control, a system was put in place whereby central and local governments worked alongside teachers and had designated roles in educating children. Teachers continued to have autonomy in their actions and could substantially influence the curriculum. However they now worked more closely with both central and local government (Strain and Simkins 2008).

The Act established the requirement for secondary education for all and is seen by some, including Chitty (1989), as the beginning of what was to develop into the comprehensive reform. It sought an ‘end-on’ connection between primary and secondary education, introducing the 11+ intelligence tests, designed to select children, not on the basis of social

origins but on intellectual ability, that dominated education until the late 1970s (Ball 2008; Wyse and Torrance 2009). Initially these tests determined whether children would proceed to grammar, technical or secondary modern schools. Ball (2008, p.66) described this educational structure as "different types of school for different 'types' of students with different 'types of mind'". In fact the Norwood Report (1943) had described three groups of children with different 'types of minds' and in need of different curriculum material. The distinctions were between 'academic', 'practical' and 'technical' aptitudes. The Norwood Report (1943) emphasised the need for differentiated secondary provision, "we have treated secondary education as that phase of education on which differences between pupils receive the consideration due to them" (Chitty 1989, p.24). However, by the end of the 1950s this system had begun to be criticised because of the constraints it placed on children from less favoured backgrounds. Instead, in Circular 10/65, a 'comprehensive' system was envisaged in which the tripartite system was to be abolished, leaving the way open for a more uniform educational experience for all (Carr and Hartnett 1996). Ball (1994) suggested that this move was to create a 'moral tradition' that had an impact on primary and secondary education, in which the focus shifted from individualisation to a consideration of shared values with a communitarian approach. While Circular 10/65 had no legal standing it had a significant impact on the education system and many LEAs decided to reorganise their secondary schools accordingly. However, this development was slow and the reform was characterised by "dissolution and conservation", with a remaining commitment to social division (Ball, 2008, p.68). By the 1970s comprehensivisation was under attack for its limited success. Whilst it promised to improve the educational achievements of children from working class backgrounds, there was still a class divide in schools (Carr and Hartnett 1996).

Teachers at this time were also experiencing change in their classrooms' diversity, primarily as a consequence of the communitarian approach of embracing equality within the education system. In order to ascertain whether a child was capable of being educated and, if so by whom, clinical testing was carried out (Thomas and Vaughan 2004). Clough (2000) likened this form of assessment to a psycho-medical model, in which disabled children were subjected to assessment to ascertain their impairment. Farrell (2010) described this as a deficit model in which the identification of need was located exclusively with the child and not related to any wider social context. Children were seen as suffering from a handicap of the mind, or body, or both. Whilst their needs ranged in complexity, combining both physical and sensory impairments, collectively they were seen as educationally subnormal: defective,

feeble-minded and morally lax (Mason 2000; Vaughan 2002). Only a tiny minority of those children who were then recognised as having what are now referred to as special needs were offered mainstream places (Thomas and Vaughan 2004).

The great social changes of the 1960s and 1970s prompted a significant development in attitudes towards disabled people, alongside other oppressed groups, exemplified in the Sex Discrimination Act (1975) and the Race Relations Act (1976) (Banks 1981; Kailin 2002). In the 1970s there was a radical re-examination of disability which encouraged a move away from focusing upon children's medical needs towards considering their needs from a social perspective (Hodkinson and Vickerman 2009). Disabled children's segregation from mainstream schools had been addressed in the Education (Handicapped Children) Act (1970) which proposed that all children were educable and supported the view that a greater range of pupils should be educated in mainstream settings (Thomas and Vaughan 2004). In effect the introduction of the Education Act (1970) encouraged a move away from locating the 'causation of disability' solely with the child (Callaghan 2009; Hodkinson and Vickerman 2009). Subsequently, the Education Act (1976) gave responsibility for the education of children with SEN to their LEAs. More children were offered mainstream places if it was practical, if their education needs were compatible with mainstream education and if this could be accomplished at a reasonable cost to the public purse (Thomas and Vaughan 2004).

The Warnock Report (1978) and the development of integration

The Warnock Committee started working on integration strategies for the government a few years after the Education Act (1970). It developed a number of key concepts that are still present in today's schools and generated a new terminology that remains current in educational discourse. The Warnock Report (1978) described three types of integration that occurred in mainstream schools. Firstly, 'locational integration' referred to the use of separate units inside mainstream schools for children with SEN; 'social integration' for children from these special units included eating or playing alongside their mainstream peers; 'functional integration' described a situation in which children with SEN had classes or activities alongside their peers, either part or full-time. The Warnock Report found varying degrees of integration in practical use in mainstream schools and Thomas and Vaughan (2004) claimed that the report endorsed all of these types of integration. In doing so, while bringing

integration to the forefront of political discussion, the report did not project a strong stance on the need for integration. Slee (1997, p.413) believed that, although integration had the potential to offer a "vehicle for a new traffic in traditional special educational practice" the term was used in a limited fashion to address only the placement of children with SEN into mainstream settings.

The change in terminology for children with SEN was linked to encouragement for an increased integration. Warnock said that teachers must be willing to accept a broader concept of SEN, meaning that five or six children in each class would have an SEN that required temporary or permanent support. The use of new terms to describe more widespread educational needs led to children who were already mainstream-educated being assessed as having an 'SEN' (Cole 2005; Galloway and Edwards 1991). The plan to reposition pupils on a flexible SEN continuum did not produce the expected outcomes in terms of transfer from outside to inside mainstream. While there was diagnosis of children who had not previously been regarded as having SEN, for others the move to mainstream meant transferring from segregation outside mainstream to segregation within it (Galloway and Edwards 1991).

The Warnock Report also expanded on the assessment process in an attempt to move away from clinical assessment. Instead, it had three criteria for entry to mainstream schools – assessment determined whether a child would cope in mainstream; mainstream education had to be a good use of resources and integration for children with SEN mustn't hinder the education of their peers (Northway 1997). Children with SEN would be entering an education system designed for 'normal' pupils. Mason (2000) said that only those closest to their mainstream peers could be successfully integrated but they would struggle in an established mainstream system. For teachers and schools, this led to a decade of increased diversity in the classrooms, without clear guidance about what they should do once children with SEN had been admitted (Gray 2006; Jones *et al.,* 2006). Thomas and Vaughan (2004) suggested continuing unsuccessful integration occurred because the committee that developed Warnock's work was dominated by non-disabled academics. This led to the idea that integration was being used by able-bodied people to determine the educational route of children with SEN, without truly providing them with the right equal access to education (Croll and Moses 2003; Sikes *et al.,* 2007).

Outside special education, Carr and Harnett (1996) identified that, in the mid-1970s, education debate concerning the success of comprehensivisation intensified in line with societal concerns produced by the decline in the economy. The Black Papers, written between 1969 and 1977, decried the decline in educational standards. These papers advocated the "restoration of traditional teaching, traditional standards, traditional methods of streaming and selection, and traditional schools" (Carr and Harnett 1996, pp.106). The focus on changing relationships between the government and schools continued within the Education Act (1980). LEAs enjoyed partnership with both government and schools; in turn they had responsibility for many locally driven decisions. However, the Education Act (1980) removed power from LEAs and centralised control whilst empowering parents (The National Archives 2011). In effect, the school system became 'privatised' and was accountable to an external audience – the general public. For the first time LEAs had to acknowledge parental choice and schools were henceforth to operate on a 'level playing field' from which they had to appeal to parents (Galloway *et al.,* 1998). This was the first phase of a new competitive ethos amongst schools, establishing a market-led change in the education system. Ball (1994) said that this new market-led focus replaced the communitarian principles of comprehensivisation. Schools, according to Ball (1994, p.146), now contributed to "offering a solitary view of fulfilment, free of the complications arising from tiresome moral demands by others".

Wyse and Torrance (2009) noted that there was a growth in classroom-based research on the curriculum by teachers in the 1960s, 70s and 80s and this was accompanied by the work of professional subject associations and curriculum development programmes. However, the publication of 'Better Schools' (1985) established another move towards more centralised government of the education system. This White Paper emphasised the need for teachers to be held accountable for their performance and for government to have more control of the curriculum on a national scale (DES 1985). The subsequent Education Reform Act (1988) reinforced and extended both the Education Act (1980) and the 'Better Schools' White Paper (1985). Ball (2008) said that this legislation disempowered teachers by removing their ability to make important decisions on the curriculum. In fact, both curriculum decision-making and assessment processes were centralised. Additionally, teachers' unions were fragmented in the process and the government took control of standards objectives.

The Education Reform Act (1988) sought to develop a national curriculum wherein all mainstream pupils benefited from the same knowledge, skills and understanding of life beyond the education system (Stobart 2001). In relation to children with SEN this act sought to value difference and considered the ways in which all children could contribute as citizens. The government wanted to provide a nationally accredited curriculum that not only developed each child spiritually, morally, culturally, mentally and physically but also targeted their educational development for adult employability (The National Archives 2011). Her Majesty's Inspectors of Schools (HMI) proposed developing a breadth to the curriculum that considered the 'whole' child's experiences (Harnett and Vinney 2008).

The Education Reform Act (1988) linked curriculum breadth to traditional subjects in primary schools. In doing so, it identified nine prescribed subjects and provided teachers with guidelines on what and how they should teach (Harnett and Vinney 2008; Stobart 2001). There were core subjects – English, maths and science – alongside non-core subjects such as history, geography and music (Stobart 2001). These subject areas worked mainly in isolation from one another and Harnett and Vinney (2008) noted little evidence of an acknowledgement of the whole-child's learning experience. Additionally, Chitty (2008) considered the curriculum to be 'too simplistic and ill-considered.' The notion of a common curriculum had been rejected in favour of a subject focused curriculum. For Chitty, this curriculum was 'bureaucratic' and primarily concerned with the need to assess standards. Galloway and colleagues noted (1998, p.43) that the newfound focus on accountability had replaced the "humanitarian benevolence of the post-war 'special needs' discourse". Clough (1998) said that the curriculum had always been exclusionary because it used a normalising discourse of categorising children who do not meet the national standard. As such the curriculum attributes their 'failure' to individualised factors, such as gender, ethnicity, SEN or socio-economic location (Nutbrown and Clough 2006). For children with SEN who are assessed to determine their educational needs, their 'ability' is measured in relation to what learning can take place in the curriculum. Clough (1998, p.13) concluded that "such decisions themselves reach deep into political ideology, for the curriculum is and always has been a selection from culture for particular ends".

Wyse and Torrance (2006) contended that the national curriculum provided clarity in content and desired outcomes and enabled the creation of comparative national standards. However, Swann and Brown (1997) noted that developments in the National Curriculum were not

considered from a classroom perspective and, therefore, teachers implemented the curriculum according to their own ideas of day to day practice. Strain and Simkins (2008) referred to the National Curriculum as a regulatory format on a national level that contradicted any pupil-centred needs or locally driven accountability. Furthermore, Chitty and Simon (1993) described the significance of these developments in comparison to international schools. They said that no other country at this time had such centralised government control.

Whilst LEAs and teachers were stripped of their autonomy this new centralised control by government offered both schools and parents specific forms of autonomy. The Education Act (1988) provided schools with the freedom to decide if they wanted to remain attached to their LEAs or whether they would prefer to become grant-maintained. Ideologically, the Conservative government emphasised that this move would enable schools to be removed from LEA shackles (Flude and Hammer 1990). Schools were given increased power to make decisions on funding in response to the education market while parent empowerment was a prominent objective of the Education Reform Act (1988). Parents were identified as consumers in a new marketised system, which focused on supply and demand. At the same time, parents' votes were essential for schools looking for grant-maintained status. The government insisted that any such school must have the support of at least 20% of its parents. In this new market driven system, schools had become service providers and parents were being urged to work in partnership with them (Strain and Simkins 2008).

Children with special educational needs and the introduction of the standards agenda

The Education Act (1981) had been developed from the Warnock Report (1978) and was specifically focused on children with SEN. This legislation instructed LEAs to take responsibility for integrating children with SEN, taking into account parents' views. The statementing process was introduced to assess children with SEN and look at their suitability for mainstream schooling but statementing in fact became an assessment of the severity of a child's SEN. According to Armstrong (2005) the process remained focused on a deficit model of disability and evaluated a child's ability to access education in association with segregational provisions.

The National Curriculum was developed on the basis of four key stages which considered child development according to chronological age but Bines (2000) stated that deciding upon

development in this way did not account for a wide range of pupil achievement. In section 18 of the Education Reform Act (1988) children with SEN were said to be included in the National Curriculum. Adaptations of the National Curriculum were not promoted by this legislation; instead teachers were given the task of differentiating their curriculum offer on the basis of children's individual needs. In extreme circumstances teachers could avoid National Curriculum criteria entirely for children with SEN, if a child's needs meant that they were inappropriate. The application of the Act varied widely geographically and the statementing process came to be exploited by LEAs who used delaying tactics to manage the minimal funding available for resources (Clough 1998). Whilst the core objectives of the Education Reform Act (1988) disempowered teachers, school diversity was expressed within the legislation as a form of 'autonomy' for teachers (Strain and Simkins 2008). At a time of the overall centralisation of power with government, control of the education of children with SEN was dispersed.

The impact of the Education Reform Act (1988) on special education

Harnett and Vinney (2008) described how children appeared to have access to a greater breadth of curriculum experiences. However, many schools focused narrowly on English and maths. Learning in areas like history appeared to differ across institutions and was not prioritised in curriculum delivery. Alexander and colleagues (1992; p123) said "there is clear evidence to show that much topic work has led to fragmentary and superficial teaching and learning". Instead of considering the child's learning experiences collectively, separate subject teaching was advocated in order to ensure all topics were covered.

In 1991, the Parents' Charter was introduced, giving parents the right to information about their local schools, based on performance. The Department for Education (2011) described this as an 'information revolution', in which parents were able to access performance tables comparing school success. Pierson (1998) regarded this move as inevitable following the development of a marketised education system. The basis of information for parents was to be twofold; it was to be derived from a public assessment process and also from inspections of individual schools. An assessment framework had been developed by the Task Group on Assessment and Testing (TGAT) and was initially based exclusively on teacher assessment, later developing into formal Statutory Assessment Tests (SATs). These summative assessment at the end of each key stage were used to develop a nationally understood form of

assessment. For primary schools this covered English and maths tasks in Key Stage One and SATs in English, maths and science in Key Stage Two. In effect there had been a significant move away from teacher assessment of the curriculum towards a focus on national assessment in both literacy and numeracy (Stobart 2001).

In 1992 these results became publicly available in national league tables, wherein schools were ranked according to what percentage of their children had achieved the desired 'national average' (Higgs *et al.*, 1998). The publication of the SAT results in league tables made the SAT process a high stakes test for schools. The results produced by the SAT process were used by government to judge school and teacher success (Yarker 2006). In developing the SAT process, the Task Group on Assessment and Testing Systems (TGAT) had envisaged an incorporation of teacher assessments alongside SATs, with an emphasis on teacher involvement. However, the transition of the SAT process to a national form of assessment that produced league tables (Wyse and Torrance 2009) meant that only children who were of 'average' achievement or above could contribute to these performance tables. Schools were in effect being measured on their ability to educate as many children as possible to achieve an 'average grade' or higher in SATs. Schools that appeared lower down in league tables were seen as failing in this process and, in turn, children were seen by government and the media as failing if they did not achieve the desired average (Barton 1987; George and Clay 2008). Bagley and Woods (1998, p.83) recorded a statement from a deputy head at this time regarding the intake of children with SEN.

> Our intake has been very much special educational needs, difficult students- we are good at working with difficult students, we have a name for it. Now that is counter productive because if you get known out there as being good with difficult children you tend to draw difficult students. If we attract less able children our exam results are poor, our position in the league table is poor and we attract fewer able children the next year. It's that sort of downward spiral.

The use of national league tables meant that schools' competitiveness increased further, as they were now measured and compared by means of this form of assessment (Clough 2000). Armstrong (1998) concluded that schools found themselves under pressure to move resources away from children with SEN and towards those who could achieve and contribute to the school's reputation. The externalised assessment process appeared to become a powerful

prompt for exclusion, as the presence of children with SEN could be detrimental to school performance, although Wyse and Torrance (2009) found that the margins of success in SATs could be narrow for any child.

The Education Act (1992) privatised the inspection process and set up the Office for Standards in Education (Ofsted), a non-ministerial department. The number of HMIs was greatly reduced and Ofsted developed independent teams to inspect schools. Schools were subject to intermittent external assessment by Ofsted to ensure that they were adhering to the standards objectives (Brown *et al.*, 2002; Gillard 2011; Lawton 1996). The Education Act (1992) envisaged 'improvement through inspection', using inspection to hold schools even more publicly accountable for their actions (Chapman 2002). The Chief Inspector of Schools was instructed to use inspections data to inform the Secretary of State and to produce and publish reports on individual schools. Inspections were to occur every four years for each school, to ensure continuous assessment of standards. Additionally, Ofsted inspections were to cover more aspects than had ever been inspected before, including ensuring that educational standards were achieved, that resources were being managed effectively and in line with the national curriculum and that children were developing morally, spiritually and culturally (Lawton 1996). In 1995, Ofsted developed a seven-scale rating system in which schools were graded from 1 (poor) through to 7 (excellent) and their grades became a publicly recognised measure of school success (Rustemier 2002).

There appeared to be a period of review influenced by the standards agenda's objectives in 1992 and 1993. Gillard (2011) noted that the *Curriculum Organisation and Classroom Practice in Primary Schools* discussion paper (1992) critiqued the teachers' role. This paper said that teachers should be seen as 'instructors' rather than as 'facilitators' of the curriculum. More emphasis on the subjects within the curriculum was deemed necessary. This paper viewed primary teachers as not holding appropriate subject-specific expertise adequately to address the curriculum. The Dearing Report (1993) focused on the needs of teachers in implementing the National Curriculum. This review maintained a commitment to the breadth of subjects in the curriculum but also advised that curriculum content be reduced so that teachers could use a fifth of their teaching time as they wished (Gillard 2011; Harnett and Vinney 2008). This flexibility was offered so that schools could design their own curricula (Lawton 1996). However, Galton and colleagues (1999) determined that 25% of the teachers in their study experienced no change in the curriculum following the Dearing Report. Those

who found ‘space’ as a consequence of the reduction spent more time on teaching the basics, or extending topics in more depth. Only 19% used this time for additional activities, such as assemblies.

In 1992, the White Paper *‘Choice and Diversity’: a network for schools*, described the diversity amongst children

> Uniformity in educational provision presupposes that children are all basically the same and that local communities have essentially the same educational needs. The reality is that children have different needs. The provision of education should be geared more to local circumstances and individual needs: hence our commitment to diversity in education. (Gillard 2011, p.1).

This reference to diversity highlighted the need for variety in comprehensive schooling, further encouraging a move away from LEAs towards the use of grant-maintained schools. The White Paper attacked comprehensive schooling and endeavoured to focus more on local circumstances and individual learning. By differentiating between educational needs the paper clearly defined the differences between specialisation and selection,

> The fact that a school is strong in a particular field may well increase the demand to attend, but it does not necessarily follow that selective entry criteria have to be imposed by the school. The selection that takes place is parent-driven. The principle of open access remains. As demand to attend increased, so the school may simply require extra resources to cope with the range of talent available.
> (Chitty 2002, p.45).

The subsequent White Paper, *Self-Government for Schools*, focused on ‘choice, diversity and specialisation’. The paper said:

> Children have different abilities, aptitudes, interests and needs. These cannot all be fully met by a single type of school, at least at secondary level. The Government wants parents to be able to choose from a range of good schools of different types, matching what they want for their child with what a school offers. The choice should include schools which select by academic ability, so that the most able

> children have the chance to achieve the best of which they are capable… Independent schools, church schools and grammar schools have long offered choice for some parents

(DfEE 1996, p.45).

If the paper had led to legislation, grant maintained schools would have been free to select up to 80% of their pupil intake by ability and LEA schools would have been able to select up to 20%. However, any such plans by the Conservative government for secondary specialisation and a divided secondary school system were halted with the election of the Labour Government in 1997 (Chitty 2002).

Nevertheless, the need to cater for diversity in children continued to influence subsequent education legislation. The Education Act (1993) had encouraged early intervention and assessment of children with SEN in order to consider their educational needs (Armstrong 2005) and Thomas and Vaughan (2004) determined that parental agreement was strengthened in the appeal process for integration into mainstream schools. The Code of Practice (1994) had introduced a five stage assessment procedure which ranged initially from classroom monitoring to statutory assessment. The role of the Special Educational Needs Co-ordinator (SENCO) was created by this legislation and the SENCO was to produce Individual Education Plans (IEPs) for each child with SEN. In turn, SENCOs managed effective teaching strategies and the resources necessary for the effective integration of children with SEN (Armstrong 2005). There appeared to be increasing legislative acknowledgement of the need to consider diversity, specifically in assessing the needs of children with SEN. Nevertheless, children with SEN continued to be viewed separately from their peers and were considered first and foremost in terms of their educational deficits (Farrell 2010).

The combination of the standards agenda with the new concept of inclusion

Internationally, papers were published from a social justice perspective that recommended a move away from integration to the inclusion of children (Rustemier 2002). The Inclusion Charter (CSIE, 1989) for the first time looked at inclusive practice as a ‘human rights platform’. In doing so “the cornerstone of human rights is that human dignity resides in every person, simply by virtue of being human and this dignity should be recognised and respected by all” (Rustemier, 2002, p.8). From an international perspective the United

Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child (1989) advocated four principles. These were the need for non-discriminatory action respecting equality of opportunity; the need to ensure the best interests of the child; the need to consider child development broadly and the need to respect the child's voice in decision-making. The right to an education was inherent in these principles. Importantly, the UN Standard Rules on the Equalization of Opportunities for Persons with Disabilities (1993) had determined that children with SEN should be considered within all planning and curricular activities, with an assurance that appropriate additional support is available (Rustemier 2002). Moreover, the Salamanca Statement: Framework for Action for SEN (UNESCO 1994) insisted upon education for all children. The statement highlighted the need for inclusion and envisaged a system in which the norm would be for all children to be educated in mainstream schools regardless of each child's need (Nutbrown and Clough 2006). CSIE stated,

> regular schooling with this inclusive orientation are the most effective means of combating discriminatory attitudes, creating welcoming communities, building on an inclusive society and achieving education for all; moreover, they provide an effective education to the majority of children and improve the efficiency and ultimately the cost-effectiveness of the entire education system (CSIE 1995, p.5).

However, Clough (1998, p.5) detailed concerns that inclusion meant more than just presence in mainstream schools. He stated

> In this multinational urge for inclusion lies the danger of physical inclusion but curricular and emotional exclusion unless children are included for and of themselves, by teachers who are professionally and personally equipped to provide appropriate education for all. For inclusion is about a radical deal more than physical location.

Here Clough described the philosophical concept of inclusion as being a way of thinking and of embracing, in perception, practice and resources, an inclusive ethos to teaching. Furthermore, Barton (1998a, p.5) discussed this philosophy in terms of social justice, stating

> it is about listening to unfamiliar voices, being open, empowering all members and about celebrating 'difference' in dignified ways… inclusive experience is about… how, where and why, and with what consequences, we educate all pupils… [and] involves a serious commitment to the task of identifying, challenging and contributing to the removal of injustices.

The *Excellence in Schools* (1997) White Paper explained that all children could achieve excellence in their education and this paper listed specific targets that schools were expected to meet. By 2002, there was greater awareness of standards combined with increased expectations and also a zero tolerance ethos in which failing schools must either improve or face closure. Additionally, the paper initiated the development of an Early Years curriculum for 3-6 year olds with an emphasis upon literacy and numeracy development. The push for standards was based on 1996 SAT results, in which six out of ten Key Stage 2 children achieved the 'national average' for their age. The government saw this as under-achievement and insisted upon improved standards (Education in England 2013).

The Excellence in Schools (1997) White Paper proposed the need for policies to benefit all children in mainstream schools and that the rights of children with SEN should be upheld (Education in England 2013). The *Excellence for All Children: Meeting Special Educational Needs* (1997) Green Paper came out in the same year. This marked a departure from the era of integration, focusing on the provisions and support available for children with SEN to succeed (Sikes *et al.*, 2007). Fundamentally, integration became inclusion, in which schools needed to 'accommodate' the needs of children with SEN and adapt educationally to meet those needs (Hodkinson and Vickerman 2009). Inclusion aimed at changing societal and educational perceptions of disability, encouraging an acceptance of diversity (Avramidis and Norwich 2002). Inclusion became an ideological tool for the projected future of education in which all children were to be fully included in every aspect of the schooling experience, benefiting from an ongoing process of development (Booth *et al.*, 2000; Winter 2006). Secretary of State, David Blunkett (Armstrong 1998) said that good provision for children with SEN meant being tough-minded and determined to show that such children can achieve excellence. In this context Nutbrown and Clough (2006) saw inclusion as a platform for social justice, dependant not only on structural changes in provision and support, but also on educating schools and professionals on inclusive practice in relation to equality, diversity and the rights of all children.

Significantly, the *Excellence for All Children* (1997) paper had two main foci that aligned the development of inclusion with the educational achievement of children with SEN (DfEE 1997). The paper suggested that recognition of SEN issues was integral to the remedy for general educational underachievement. The paper described standards that were equally applicable for children with SEN (Bines 2000). These key principles were supported by an emphasis on early intervention, on the responsibilities of both LEAs and teachers for children with SEN specifically and by the commitment to reduce the need for statementing through providing effective support within the classroom (Bines 2000). However, Clough (2000) critiqued the implementation of this paper, saying that these key principles centred on locational inclusion as there was no mention of barriers faced by children with SEN in mainstream settings. They also argued that there was insufficient focus on provision for children with SEN and on the curriculum they should be taught. Armstrong (1998) added that there was little attention given to the curriculum and teaching of children with SEN, and that the primary focus was on 'target-setting'. In fact, inclusion was discussed primarily using the educational mantras of standards that did not effectively consider SEN (Armstrong 2005).

Children with SEN were considered in the same context as their peers in relation to existing objectives, such as the National Curriculum and the SAT process that was designed for pupils who could achieve the national average (Bines 2000). This included the introduction of the p-scale system in 1998, which provided an add-on to the National Curriculum for children with SEN. The p-scales were put in place to measure levels of attainment lower than the first level of the National Curriculum (Ndaji and Tymms 2010). Understandably, Booth *et al.* (2000) argued that inclusion remained locked into focusing on a child's SEN.

The publication of the Index for Inclusion in 2000 by the Centre for Studies of Inclusive Education (CSIE), provided schools with a resource to support inclusive development (Booth *et al.,* 2000; Clough 2000). The second edition of this Index appeared in 2002 (Booth *et al.,* 2002) and another edition, focusing specifically on early years settings, followed in 2004 (Booth and Ainscow 2004). The Index advised practitioners to self-review their own practice and become part of inclusive decision making. The index considered the views of practitioners, children, parents/carers and members of surrounding communities and the materials in it were designed to build on this existing knowledge. The Index for Inclusion (2000) was concerned with the educational focus on standards, competition and inspection

and this led to consequences in the building of communities of support for children and practitioners. The authors offered a more 'supportive' approach, emphasising the need for play in improving the quality of teaching (Booth and Ainscow 2004). The Index viewed inclusion in its broadest sense:

> Some continue to want to make inclusion primarily about 'special needs education' or the inclusion in education of children and young people with impairments but that position seems absurd. If inclusion is about the development of comprehensive community education and about prioritising community over individualism beyond education, then the history of inclusion is the history of these struggles for an education system which serves the interests of communities and which does not exclude anyone within those communities.

(Booth *et al.,* 2000, p.118).

Although the Index said that inclusion usually concerned children with SEN, it considered the concept in its broadest sense for all mainstream pupils. Its definition of inclusion therefore focused on a need to value all pupils and to view difference as a resource to support learning. This definition was important as it highlighted the need for equality, for all children to be valued and accepted. Clough (2000, p. 29) considered this definition as, possibly, an "…emergence of a more homogeneous response to inclusive schooling with individual learners' rights to inclusive education – as well as needs for individually appropriate education – at centre stage?" Booth and Ainscow (2004, p.6) said "Inclusion happens as soon as the process of increasing participation is started" and the Index recommended the development of communities that celebrate all children's achievements (Booth and Ainscow 2004). Therefore, it discussed the social model of disability as the need to acknowledge disability in the context of the barriers present within education. In doing so, it promoted the creation of a non-discriminatory environment in which difference was positively embraced. Exclusion was defined in the Index as any pressures that prevent full participation for any children; this use of the term exclusion is very different to 'disciplinary exclusion'.

There was a focus in the Index for Inclusion on reducing barriers to play, learning and participation for all children and it encompassed the participation of all children as well as adults. This included planning activities with the educational needs of the children in the

class in mind. The Index's focus on removing barriers contrasted with its use of the term 'Special Educational Needs'. Focusing inclusion on children with SEN is seen as a limitation. Such a focus prevents the consideration of all learners' need for inclusion and it does not link exclusion to the barriers that hinder implementation. The Index provided three interconnected dimensions of inclusive improvement – creating inclusive cultures, producing inclusive policies and evolving inclusive practices. An inclusive setting, according to the Index, develops continuously and, while full inclusion may be desirable, it can never fully be achieved. This is because of exclusory pressures that are either persistent, or present in new forms over time (Booth and Ainscow 2004). Clough and Nutbrown (2002) found that some schools and LEAs had positive views of the Index, particularly regarding developments for early years practitioners in personally reflecting on what inclusion meant to them. However, they also found that many early childhood settings were not familiar with the Index, either because they had not been established when the publication was distributed or because they found it difficult to implement in practice.

The Special Educational Needs and Disability Act (2001) (SENDA) extended the power of the Disability Discrimination Act (1995). Historically, policies had avoided connecting the education of children with SEN with the politics of disability (Oliver 1996). This legislation attempted to divert the focus on including children with SEN from consideration of their impairment and towards educational barriers (Armstrong 2005). However, at the same time, early intervention and assessment of children with SEN remained essential in ascertaining their educational needs. The Revised Code of Practice (DfES 2001) replaced the five stage assessment process with two pre-statutory 'School Action' and 'School Action Plus' policies. Where underachievement was linked to disability, the former required that internal action should be taken by the school. Subsequently, if there was no progress, the latter would involve seeking external help and formal assessment (Armstrong 2005). *Removing Barriers to Achievement: the Government's Strategy for SEN* (2004) reinforced the concept of inclusion in connection with the Every Child Matters (2003) Green Paper (DfES 2004). Armstrong (2005) said that, in effect, children with SEN were seen as 'vulnerable' using a framework similar to that used in child protection. Early intervention was emphasised as were the essential need for multidisciplinary teams and acceptance of the moral right to an education. Dyson (2001, p.144) said that this offered "the sort of 'hook' that is now needed … [for] 'reconnecting' educational difficulty to wider issues in social economic disadvantage".

Removing Barriers to Achievement indicated that barriers for children with SEN were present both in the environment and as a result of the child's impairment. It said that environmental barriers included an inappropriate grouping of pupils and inflexible teaching styles or curricular material (DfES 2004). These barriers, alongside those based on the child's impairment, were deemed as having a potentially significant impact on opportunities in mainstream education. An Inclusion Development Programme was established to gather evidence on effective inclusionary practice. This focused on children on the autistic spectrum (ASD), those with behavioural, emotional and social difficulties (BESD) that included dyslexia and those with moderate learning difficulties (MLD), who were to be the first children to be investigated. Effective practice based on their needs was to be established (DfES 2004). In effect, whilst social barriers were acknowledged in this document, they were directly associated once more with barriers derived from children's individual SEN deficits.

Significantly, throughout multiple pieces of legislation and government documents there has been no fixed definition of inclusion. Nutbrown and Clough (2006) considered inclusion to be operational, as opposed to conceptual, because of the multiplicity of its manifestations. Fredrickson and Cline (2002) said that government legislation on inclusion comes from a focus either on disability or on issues of advantage and marginalisation. This can be seen in policies specifically associated with children with SEN which focus on their disability, including the *Excellence for all children: Meeting Special Educational Needs* paper (DfEE 1997). In contrast, the Index for Inclusion (2000) considered all children and, in turn, issues of advantage and marginalisation across pupils in mainstream schools (Booth *et al.*, 2000). However, Fredrickson and Cline (2002) noted a shift in legislation from a focus on children with SEN to the inclusion of children from disadvantaged backgrounds. This is visible in the *Excellence for all children* (1997) paper linking children with SEN and underachievement more generally and in the link to child protection issues in *Removing Barriers to Achievement: the Government's Strategy for SEN* (2004) (Bines 2000; DfES 2004). Different concepts of inclusion focus on acknowledging all children and disputing any form of marginalisation at the same time as they continue to consider children with SEN separately (Fredrickson and Cline 2002).

Bines (2000) and others describe the limitations on inclusion as being determined by the dominance of the standards agenda. The Literacy and Numeracy strategies of 1998 and 1999 changed the school timetable so that half of all primary teaching time was spent on literacy and numeracy (DfES 1998, 1999). Harnett and Vinney (2008) said that many teachers at that time could have argued that the changes destroyed the broad and balanced curriculum, instead narrowing definitions of achievement to English and maths. Curriculum 2000 subsequently restored an obligation for all primary schools to teach the full range of subjects detailed in the curriculum, without de-emphasising the importance of literacy and numeracy (Harnett and Vinney 2008). The Primary National Strategy (DfES 2003) further outlined the features of an outstanding primary school, which included having a broad and balanced curriculum.

In 2008 the Early Years Foundation Stage (EYFS) curriculum established standards for early years providers. These standards specifically focused on children from birth to five years of age (DfE 2008). However, children with SEN cannot always meet nationally age appropriate standards (Bines 2000). Ainscow (1999) says that, politically, inclusion is given equal weight to standards. Armstrong argued that inclusion is a normative concept, conceptualised in terms of conformity with existing standards objectives and in effect providing children with SEN with an 'opportunity to conform' (Armstrong 2005). However, the standards agenda, both in government-led reforms and in the changes made to professional practice, has not altered to promote an inclusive education system (Bines 2000). In fact, the 20% of children for whom these objectives do not apply may well be the 20% of children with SEN described in the Warnock Report (1978). For Levitas (1998, p.3)

> the individual child is constructed within the discourse of *raising achievement* and *promoting inclusion* in two polarised ways: either in relation to norms of standards and targets or as outsiders 'in a society whose structural inequalities remain largely uninterrogated'.

In such a context terms such as inclusion and SEN are applied to manage the issue of disability as it conflicts with the existing schooling system. Barton (1987) noted that SEN was seen as a euphemism for failed children rather than as a label that was symptomatic of a failed system.

In 2008 the SAT process did come under scrutiny but this was not because of its exclusionary methods of assessment. SATs results in that academic year were delayed and produced inaccurate outcomes that were attributed to administrative failure. In turn, the Education Testing Service, which had been used to mark SATs, lost its contract and Ken Boston, Chief Executive of the Qualifications and Curriculum Authority (QCA) resigned (Guardian 2008). In response, a quarter of schools across the United Kingdom boycotted the SAT process in the election year of 2010 (BBC 2010). Teachers and unions collectively stated that SATs were misused to develop league tables that stigmatize children, teachers and schools as successes or failures (Guardian 2010). The subsequent *Importance of Teachers* (2010) White Paper explained that in recent years schools had been subject to a compliance regime of centralised control. Instead, this White Paper recommended that schools be accountable to parents, their pupils and local communities for their performance. In doing so, the paper urged more transparency in the standardised information provided to parents so that they could have the opportunity to make effective comparisons of school success. The SAT process is officially represented as beneficial for pupil achievement, particularly in the publication of information on disadvantaged pupils. Therefore, it appears from the White Paper that the use of SATs and league tables will continue as a form of public accountability (DfE 2010).

Summarising the socio-historical development of the inclusion and standards agendas

The inclusion and standards agendas have been introduced and regulated in very different ways. The inclusion agenda appeared only part way through this chapter as it grew out of the almost complete historical segregation of disabled and different children, through the era of integration to the placement of children with SEN in the mainstream, extending to consider the provisions and barriers present in the contemporary classroom (Clough 2000). However, there are multiple definitions of inclusion and it is not clear whether inclusion is intended solely for children with SEN or for all mainstream pupils (Frederickson and Cline 2002). The standards agenda does not possess such complex inconsistencies. To date it has retained its original objectives of accountability and achievement. In doing so, the focus has remained on providing teachers, schools and LAs with objectives that they must meet (Stain and Simkins 2008). Officially, parental knowledge has been at the forefront of the standards agenda's objectives, using methods such as the SAT process to make public comparisons of school success (George and Clay 2008).

The inclusion agenda has objectives that are flexible in today's education system, providing an ideological plan for the future of education, while standards agenda objectives have, since the Education Reform Act (1988), become increasingly prescriptive. Standards agenda objectives are designed for day to day classroom implementation and are of great importance for the measurement of both teacher and school success. The introduction of the standards agenda changed the education system, creating a new focus on standards and accountability. Its objectives transformed the system into a marketable commodity, focusing on school to school competition to increase standards (Winter 2006). The introduction of inclusion did not change existing standards objectives. Instead, add-on systems, such as the p-scale and requirements to adapt both curriculum and assessment processes to 'accommodate' children with SEN were put in place (Hodkinson and Vickerman 2009). This highlights the question asked by Hodkinson and Vickerman (2009) as to whether inclusion can only be implemented through the standards agenda objectives.

Literature review – Political perspective

The development of comprehensive reform from the 1940s

The reform designed to establish a comprehensive system, accessible to all, gained momentum after Labour's election in 1964. Following its consideration in the 1944 Education (Butler) Act the prospect of comprehensive schools had met opposition. Consequently, by the 1960s the number of pupils in comprehensive schools amounted to fewer than 5% of the secondary school population. The Education Act (1944) could be critiqued for its flexibility in allowing for adaptation without the need for further legislation. Additionally, its wording seemed to legitimise the tripartite system that consisted of grammar, technical and secondary modern secondary schools and did not go so far as to begin the process of introducing comprehensive schools (Lawton 1992).

However, Lawton (1992) noted that the Labour party at that time had existed for just over 40 years. There were many areas, including education, on which the party disagreed internally. Barker (1972) has shown that, by 1910, half of the party consisted of converts from the Liberal party who had retained their liberal beliefs. For many members the party's purpose was to represent the working classes rather than develop new ideology. As such many writers viewed the Labour party at this time as non-socialist (Lawton 1992). Instead, it suggested changes to the existing system to enable it to take into account the needs of the working classes and social justice. However, the 1945 Labour party manifesto '*Let us face the future'* had mainly supported the objectives of the 1944 Education Act and, as a result, the new Labour government needed to implement the Act without having any clear political position on it. Fenwick (1976, p. 28) noted that "the most significant aspect of parliamentary pressure for comprehensive schools at this time (1945-51) is its relative insignificance, no more than half a dozen Labour MPs came out in support of comprehensive schools throughout the first Labour Government".

In contrast to Lawton's (1992) perspective, Morgan (1981) considered the post-war Labour government to be relatively 'conservative' on educational matters, favouring grammar schools. Chitty (1989, p.19) said of comprehensivisation "It was a grass-roots movement, with no encouragement, and often fierce opposition, from central government". Simon (1985, p.29) noted "The first schools [were] established in the late 1940s or early 1950s by

certain advanced local authorities in opposition to government policy and advice, whether that government was Labour (as it was from 1945-1951) or Tory (1951-1964)". Despite this opposition the number of comprehensive schools steadily grew, from 10 in 1950 to 262 in 1965 (Benn and Simon 1972). Lawton (1992) saw this progressive development as due to the dissatisfaction of parents with 11+ testing and the quality of secondary modern schools. When new schools were built they were most often comprehensive schools.

In 1964 the incoming Labour government promised to introduce more comprehensive schools. Gordan (1986) characterised this era as one of optimism and growth, with increases in school populations and funding and a move towards more comprehensive reform. However, Labour had a specific view of education for all that involved grammar schools. Hugh Gaitskell, Labour Leader (1955-1963) wrote in The Times in 1958;

> It would be nearer the truth to describe our proposals as 'a grammar-school education for all' …Our aim is greatly to widen the opportunities to receive what is now called a grammar-school education, and we also want to see grammar-school standards in the sense of higher quality education extended far more generally.

(Benn and Chitty 1996, p.27).

The party sought high quality in education and equality of opportunity for all. However, Benn and Chitty (1996) suggested that redefining comprehensive education to encompass the idea that education for all could include grammar schools may have been a step the party would regret later. Labour's 1964 general election slogan was 'grammar schools for all' and Hargreaves (1982, p.36) said

> The slogan was [a] sophisticated one for it capitalized on the contradictions in the public's mind, parents were in favour of the retention of the grammar schools and their public examinations but opposed to the 11+ selection test as the basis for a 'once-for-all' allocation.

Circular 10/65, issued by the Labour government in 1965, was concerned primarily with how secondary schools could be reorganised in favour of comprehensivisation, to provide educational opportunities for all (Chitty 1989). The Circular reiterated Labour's definition of

comprehensive schooling and declared that all schools should have the quality of grammar schools (Benn and Chitty 1996). The Circular was described by Evans (1985, p.22) as "probably the greatest single advance in English educational history, its provisions showing real breadth of outlook and considerable educational vision". However, Chitty (1989) pointed to the fact that it had no legislative authority; instead LEAs were asked to prepare plans for comprehensive re-organisation. These plans had to be submitted to the new Department of Education and Science for approval within twelve months of the date of the Circular.

The focus at this time (1964) was on reorganisation but Chitty (1989) noted that the new Schools Council for Curriculum and Examinations did not effectively determine comprehensive curriculum content and purpose. It appeared from the Circular that the focus of comprehensive reform was not to consider the curricular needs of children from high and low socio-economic backgrounds. Instead, the curriculum seemed to focus on attempts to integrate the education of all children into one setting. In fact, the word 'curriculum' did not appear in the circular. The Plowden Report (DES 1967) advocated a 'child-centred approach' to learning but it soon came under attack for its opposition to the didactic teaching methods associated with 11+ assessment. Tomlinson (2005, p.22) said:

> The Plowden Report provided… advocacy of a progressive curriculum. Progressive education, with connotations of child-centred education as opposed to didactic teaching methods, became a focus for attacks by eminent and influential right-wing politicians…into the 1990s, usually linked in media reporting to the teaching methods adopted by 'trendy' teachers.

The 'progressive education' of the 1960s was soon seen by some critics (for example in the Black Papers) as failing the education of many children (Chitty 2009).

The Norwood Report (1943) had emphasised the need for different secondary provisions and the idea of comprehensive reform was not championed as long as the Labour leadership continued to favour grammar schools as the best prospect for competition with independent public schools. The Labour party's priority was to develop secondary modern schools amid what Chitty (1989) describes as confusion over the meaning of 'education for all' as established in the Education Act (1944). Pressure groups such as the Comprehensive Schools

Committee (CSC) found that many LEAs' plans for reorganisation were not truly comprehensive as comprehensive schools received minimal attention in looking at overall school types (Chitty 1989). In six years of government from 1964-1970 Labour established only 13 comprehensive secondary schools, accounting for fewer than 0.5% of the secondary school population (Evans 1985). In the 1970s secondary education continued to be designed primarily for those who were academically minded (Chitty (1989).

Blake (1985) describes the Conservative party in 1964-65 as divided, with some wanting to retain traditional values and others wanting to modernise the education system. Edward Heath was leader of the Conservative party (1965-1975) and became Prime Minister in 1970 for one term. His shadow spokesman for the opposition in 1965, Edward Boyle, was anti-socialist, but did not necessarily believe in 11+ testing (Chitty 2009). He thought the Conservative party should be open to comprehensive reform. Boyle believed that it was necessary to offer a variety of schools and whilst he defended grammar schools, he also wanted to test the development of more comprehensives. Moreover, he had commented in 1962 on "support for the development of secondary education along comprehensive lines [that] was gaining considerable momentum (Chitty 2009). However, Boyle, questioned by the Conservative party at their 1968 conference, said

> I will join with you willingly and wholeheartedly in the fight against socialist dogmatism whenever it rears its head. But do not ask me to oppose it with an equal and opposite Conservative dogmatism, because in education it is dogmatism itself which is wrong.

(Chitty 2009, p.29).

However, critics saw Boyle's Conservative educational direction as being far too left wing, promoting confusion over what the Conservative party stood for. Boyle was forced to stand down as Conservative education spokesman at the end of the 1960s for being seen as too 'liberal' in relation to comprehensive reform (Lawton 1996).

Ball (1984) saw the Black Papers (1969-1977) as "the beginning of the end of the period of optimism". The Black Papers criticised the progressive nature of comprehensive reorganisation and the impact it had on pupil success (Lawton 1992). The media also

launched 'horror stories' about comprehensives and this encouraged what Ball (1984) saw as moral panic about the state of secondary education. The first Black Paper, from Pedley in 1969, critiquing the comprehensive reform, suggested that the social divisions which were to be eradicated by the establishment of comprehensive schools were instead perpetuated by them. He said "4A doesn't mix with 4P, and the Cabinet Minister's son (or daughter) shows no particular eagerness to bring the bus conductor's child home for tea" (Chitty, 1989, p.45). Cox and Dyson (1969/1970) wrote mainly about returning to traditional educational values in the first three Black Papers. The emphasis in these Papers was on 'anti-modernist' and 'anti-progressivist' criticisms (Lawton 1992). Coleraine (1970, p.35/36) criticised the Conservative leadership at this point for "repeating the prevailing shibboleths without debate of any kind". However, the later Black Papers mentioned more strategies that could improve the education system. For instance, parental choice was considered (Cox and Dyson 1977) and it was suggested that schools which could not attract parents should be closed. The emphasis in the Black Papers was for competition and for parental choice of schools. It was this critique which fuelled the 1980s' education reforms (Lawton 1992).

The Labour government and the introduction of classroom diversity

The social movements of the 1960s and 1970s prompted change in social perceptions of several marginalised groups. By the latter part of the 1970s this meant that greater numbers of disabled children were to be integrated into mainstream schools (Mason 2000) with a concomitant responsibility on teachers to work with a broader range of pupils. A welfarist consensus encouraged LEAs, schools and teachers to work together with the same goal – to provide a good education across a wider spectrum of ability (Gray 2006; Jones *et al.*, 2006). With responsibility placed upon every individual within the education system, teachers were given the professional autonomy to teach their increasingly diverse pupils as they saw fit. Labour effectively relinquished its power and central control of education in favour of having all members of the school system contribute to the education process (Batterson 1999).

The emerging standards agenda

The Conservative government (1970-74) changed tack, going on the offensive to change the education system radically: "The politics of reaction gave way to the politics of reconstruction" (Chitty 1989, p.55). This reconstruction had started with the publication of

the Black Papers. Heath became Prime Minister in the General Election of 1970, with Margaret Thatcher as his Secretary of State for Education and Science. It is interesting to note that Thatcher did not make a significant impact on education when she was Secretary of State for Education and Science (Lawton 1992). At this time Thatcher said she was moderate in education and focused on matters of 'excellence' (Knight 1990). She referred to the curriculum in her 1970 speech to the Association of Education Committees and soon started to highlight the need to raise standards in education (Lawton 1992). However, by 1972 the Conservative government had not significantly contributed to policy on education. In 1973 the Conservatives started to speak of the importance of parental choice and in the 1974 General Elections standards and parental choice became the main focus of their manifesto (Lawton 1992). Hunter (1984) said that the comprehensive reform was under great political pressure from the Labour administration in 1974-79 and was about to change yet again, particularly in the economic crisis of the mid 1970s. There had already been criticisms based on the effectiveness of comprehensive schools to reduce social inequality (Lawton 1992).

Heath was defeated in 1974 by Labour's Harold Wilson (1974-1976), who was succeeded as Prime Minister by his colleague, James Callaghan (1976-79) while, in 1975, Margaret Thatcher became the Conservative party leader. From 1974 onwards the Conservative party also had input from a 'think tank,' The Centre for Policy Studies (CPS), founded by Sir Keith Joseph. However, Chitty (2009) noted that it would be incorrect to accuse the subsequent Conservative government of putting an end to the post-war 'welfare capitalist consensus'. For Chitty, this had already dissolved in the Wilson-Callaghan administration.

James Callaghan, Labour Prime Minister from 1976 to 1979, famously delivered his Ruskin speech in 1976, emphasising the need for teacher accountability and central control of the curriculum (DES 1985). There was an emphasis in this speech on standards in schools and the need for skilled workers in industry, which would be important influences on new curriculum developments. The Ruskin speech was designed in part to try and obtain political advantage over the Conservative party. It has been described by Chitty (1989, p. 20) as a "thinly-disguised attempt to wrest the populist mantle from the Conservatives, pandering to perceived public disquiet at the alleged prevalence of soft-centred progressivism". Part of the concern at this time was directed at the 'child-centred' approach advocated in the Plowden Report (1967). Between 1975-77 the media described Britain's education system as in crisis; standards had plummeted and teachers were to blame (Chitty 2009).

Chitty (1989) noted that Callaghan's speech detailed a complex mix of 'traditional and innovative thinking' and this set the tone for educational reform. However, Chitty (1989) and Jones (1989) thought the speech confirmed the move to the right educationally. Although Lawton (1992) understood and agreed with Callaghan's critical view of education, he also believed that his speech encouraged a move to the right. It marked the beginning of a breakdown in trust between the government, LEAs and teachers. Fisher (2008) illustrated three key themes that developed from the speech. Firstly, fears of underperformance were voiced which then underpinned the introduction of the Education Reform Act (1988). Secondly, teachers were targeted and an emphasis was placed on exposing their 'secret garden', ensuring the public knew of their actions. Finally, an ideological belief emerged that supported a need to move towards a market-based approach within education. The 1976 Great Debate in education, fuelled by Callaghan's speech, coincided with efforts by the DES and HMI who were attempting to 'win' teachers over to a new unified curriculum in comprehensive schools (Chitty 1989).

In 1979 Margaret Thatcher's Conservative party won the General Election. Thatcher was keen to replace Labour's socialism with a clear right-wing approach and a political discourse that encompassed the traditional social values of the Conservative party, whilst moving beyond some elements of their post-war consensus (Kavanagh 1987; Quicke 1988). The aim, as Sir Keith Joseph had stated in 1975, was to reverse Labour's left-wing approach (Salter and Tapper 1988). Thatcher carried out a policy review in 1975, named 'The Right Approach,' that shaped educational policy for the next three years. However, before the Conservative party could publish this policy document, Callaghan delivered his Ruskin speech focusing on many areas of concern that were similar to the Conservative recommendations, including standards. In the election of 1979 the Conservative party campaign focussed heavily on the failure of education (Batteson 1999). A language of crisis emerged within the campaign, warning the general public that something had to be done with the education system (Quicke 1988). The Conservatives used slogans such as 'Educashun Isnt Wurking' to highlight a breakdown in the system and in the rest of society which could only be rescued through their use of a robust interventionist approach. There was a move away from developing people to improving performance (Batterson 1999, p.62; Fisher 2008). Chitty (1989, p.14) said that the "external economic circumstances connected with internal

bureaucratic dynamic… [inspired]… widespread belief that education should be geared more closely to the economy".

Thatcher was seen by Kavanagh (1987) as having surrounded herself with like-minded Conservative party members and those who didn't subscribe to her views were replaced forthwith. She maintained strong connections with 'New Right' groups, such as The Centre for Policy Studies and the Institute for Economic Affairs, and friendly relationships with large sections of the media (Batterson 1999; Pierson 1998). In doing so, she developed a strong government that pursued her objectives vigorously (Kavanagh 1987). In fact, Chitty (1989, p.16) claimed that Margaret Thatcher's extreme yet coherent strategies for economic growth had so great an influence that any attempt to intervene would be an "exercise fought on the New Right terms". This was the context in which Sir Keith Joseph became Secretary of State for Education and Science (1981-1986) and sought radical changes (Lawton 1992). Denis Healey (1989, p.8) contextualised Thatcherism in the societal and international needs of that time. He said

> Mrs Thatcher did not create what is now called 'Thatcherism' out of the blue. She gave expression to feelings which were already colouring public opinion on both sides of the Atlantic; the attitudes she rejected had already begun to lose appeal. Underlying all these changes was a reaction throughout the developed world against the permissiveness of the 60s… Ordinary people longed for a return to order, to the family values which used to provide a moral framework for individual behaviour.

Margaret Thatcher appeared to have a strong, unified political stance. Tomlinson (2005, p.32) said that Thatcherism offered a regressive vision, praising Victorian ideas that "those who did not help themselves by making the right choices, were unworthy of state help". Consumer choice was a major focus in educational reform, Tomlinson (2005, p.32) stated

> Education was in future intended to be a commodity, with parents supposedly free to choose the quality, location and amount, and the best quality education was, as in pre-war Britain, to be a positional good which must be competitively sought. Values of competitive individualism, separation and exclusion were to be extolled and knowledge itself regarded as a commodity for private consumption.

However, Ball (1991, p.43) said Thatcherism "…must not be viewed as a unified or coherent doctrine, but as an amalgam, a blending of tensions, a managing of nascent contradictions". Thatcherism, according to Ball (1991) and Lawton (1992), was not a consistent unified ideology; it had components of new right, 'cultural rightism' and neo-liberal thinking. The neo-liberal thinking that was adopted and changed by the Conservative government centred on the collective benefits of considering individualism. Liberal ideas in the 19th century had seen collective endeavours as a threat to individual freedom within society. The Conservative government was influenced by Hayekian thinking and encouraged the need for a free market in which "the 'selfish' acts of individuals nevertheless result in the good of society" (Lawton 1992, p.4). Keith Joseph (1976) said:

> The market system is the greatest generator of national wealth known to mankind: coordinating and fulfilling the diverse needs of countless individuals in a way which no human mind or minds could ever comprehend, without coercion, without direction, without bureaucratic interference.

The Neo-Conservative ideology placed great importance on societal rules in constraining undesirable human behaviours. Traditional values of schooling and traditions in societal control, such as the 'free economy and the strong state,' were advocated. By 1988 it was no longer possible to consider the Conservative party as either traditionalists or modernisers, because their political position had become too complicated (Lawton 1992). Meanwhile, in 1989, the Labour party produced a new policy document, *'Meet the challenge, make the change'*, which strongly emphasised the importance of putting children first in education. Their position at this time focused more on socialism and the need to provide a worthwhile education for all (Lawton 1992).

In the 1980s, fuelled by the general concern arising from the economic crisis and employment constraints, parents no longer had confidence that their children were being prepared for employment (Quicke 1988). The Conservatives' response was to change the education system into a marketable commodity (Bobbit 2002). Maclure (1989) considered the Education Reform Act (1988) to be the most important piece of legislation since the Education Act 1944. Through its implementation knowledge was to be regulated and controlled by the government (Tomlinson 2005). Kenneth Baker, emphasised this in the opening speech in the Commons Second Reading debate. He said:

> Our education system has operated the past 40 years on the basis of the framework laid down by Rab Butler's 1944 Act, which in turn built on the Balfour Act of 1902. We need to inject a new vitality into that system. It has become producer-dominated. It has not proved sensitive to the demands for change that have become ever more urgent over the past 10 years. This Bill will create a new framework, which will raise standards, extend choice and produce a better informed Britain.

(Maclure 1989, p.5)

Baker compared Britain's education system with selected international schools and declared that Britain had less centralised governmental control and standardisation than other countries, for example France. However, his comparisons were selective, as many Western European schools were trying at this time to free schools from centralised control (Lawton 1989b). Conflict in Conservative policy between the needs of the state and parental choice led to Keith Joseph's resignation in 1986. Kenneth Baker, the next Secretary of State, had an agenda that had been set by the party (Lawton 1992). The changes in Britain's education system were not intended to provide stability within the education system. Instead, the Conservative government wanted to shape the education system for an indeterminate future. Maclure (1989, p.6) said

> It requires no crystal ball to reach the conclusion that it will raise more questions that it settles. This is no bad thing, in the eyes of the authors - it is designed to shake the educational establishment out of its complacent slumbers. One way of doing this is by setting up a legislative framework which leaves the future up for grabs.

Margaret Thatcher wanted to increase the power of the 'consumer' and reduce the power of the 'producers' (Whitty 2008). Traditionally, children were allocated to their nearest school by their Local Education Authority (LEA). However, the new 'public managerial state' enabled parents to choose which schools they preferred for their children. This was likened by Ball (1991, p.33) to a "phoenix of parental choice". Maclure (1989, p.6/7) said:

> The Government wants to put parents into a stronger position in relation to the education system. In part this springs from populist rhetoric: the analysis of the

> defects of the present education system which ministers have adopted, attributes many weaknesses to what Mr Baker calls the dominance of the producers. Giving more power to the consumers is a logical way to reduce that dominance. There is also the true perception that parents' encouragement and support are prime ingredients in successful education. Giving parents more power of choice could be a potent way of conscripting their commitment.

Gorard, Fitz and Taylor (2001) considered three advantages of the national programme of parental choice. Firstly, the consumer appreciates being given options. Secondly, there appears to be a form of equity that is established through parental choice. Regardless of one's background and socio-economic location, those from lower socio-economic locations could 'break the iron cage of zoning'. Finally, the use of marketisation within the education system encourages competition amongst providers and therefore seems to drive up standards collectively amongst schools. Successful schools remained popular and weaker schools either improved or faced closure. Earlier in the 1980s, a voucher scheme had been proposed in which children came with funding to their new schools. Arthur Seldon, former Editorial Director of the right-wing Institute of Economic Affairs, advocated this scheme as "…a highly flexible instrument, with many variations, that would replace the functioning of schools through taxes under political control and bureaucratic supervision by payments direct from parents thus equipped with a new ability". The scheme advocated a two tier system with either a standard education price or, for parents who could afford it, the possibility of paying a supplement so that their child could attend an independent school (Chitty 1989, p.180). Lawton (1992) viewed this political objective as representing the Conservatives' most distinctive ideological difference to the Labour party at this time. However, by the end of 1983 this scheme had been dropped, to be revived later in 1990.

While parents had more choice, the Conservatives redesigned the education system to enable greater centralized control. By this point both LEAs and teachers had seen their autonomy reduced by government and the public's trust in them damaged; they were seen as not responding to the needs of the consumer (Quicke 1988). Chitty (1989) described the education administration as having been viewed as a 'triangle of tensions', the three points of which consisted of central government, local government and individual schools. By 1976 this arrangement was undermined and the era of 'partnership' was over. Ball (1991, p.8) concluded "the educational policies of Thatcherism have involved a total reworking of the

ideological terrain of educational politics and the orientation of policy-making is now towards the consumers of education – parents and industrialists; the producer lobbies are almost totally excluded". Margaret Thatcher made little attempt to disguise her desire to destroy the concept of comprehensive schooling (Chitty 2002). As Secretary of State for Education and Science (1970-1974) she had disowned Labour's Circulars 10/65 and 10/66 on comprehensive planning although, interestingly, as Education Minister she had established more comprehensive schools than any previous minister. Withdrawal of responsibilities from LEAs followed when Thatcher became Prime Minister and they were increasingly located with central government (Lawton 1992). Moreover, schools were able to opt out of being controlled by their LEAs, creating a new category of maintained schools. Grant maintained schools were to be managed by their governing bodies and the trusts that formed them. There was understandable hostility to this from LEAs who were disposed to see opting out as a form of 'treachery'. On the other hand, the DES was, for the first time, given responsibility for managing this category of schools (Maclure 1989). Lawton (1992) concluded that changes in the education system at this time came extremely close to damaging the partnership between LEAs and the DES permanently.

The Education Reform Act (1988) consolidated these changes further, reducing teachers' responsibility for designing curricula and curbing their use of professional judgement with regard to standards (Gunter 2008). The introduction of the National Curriculum and subsequent assessment processes, including Ofsted inspections, enabled the government to control classroom content, whilst "steering at a distance" (Fisher 2008; Whitty 2008, p.166). Additionally, the Education Reform Act (1988) developed councils focused on the national curriculum and its testing, namely the National Curriculum Council (NCC) and the School Examinations and Assessment Council (SEAC). Chitty (2008) noted that the introduction of the National Curriculum was distinct from the rest of ERA's objectives. Where other objectives encouraged more autonomy in schools, particularly in moving away from LEA control, the National Curriculum developed centralised objectives that must be met. Additionally there appeared to be two models of curriculum; one that had been advocated by HMI as a common-curriculum model and one that was used as the new National Curriculum, seen by some as a 'bureaucratic' core-curriculum designed by civil servants in the DES. This model emphasised primary traditional subjects as its core curriculum.

The National Curriculum had four components; these were subjects, attainment targets, clear objectives for knowledge and a programme of study (Lawton 1989b). Kenneth Baker, who in 1989 left the DES to become chairman of the Conservative party, had felt that it was necessary to secure the support of teachers who were sceptical of these curricular changes. He claimed that the rationale for national testing was to assess and ensure student educational achievement. At the same time he considered the use of a National Curriculum to be essential to ensure common standards and regulate teacher expectations (Lawton 1989b). Thatcher had been unable to re-establish 11+ selection assessment (Chitty 2009) and in 1993 Baker said "The absence in Britain of any regular standard assessment of children's school performance was unique for a developed country" (Chitty 2002, p.70). Chitty stated (2008, p.345)

> If the curriculum has any validity for the New Right, it is surely as justification for a massive programme of national testing at 7, 11, 14 and 16, which will, in, turn, result in differentiation, selection and streaming at both the primary and secondary levels. Indeed, the whole process of curriculum standardisation and testing would be ideologically consistent with the rest of the education 'package' if it could be seen as providing evidence to parents for the desirability or otherwise of individual schools

The National Curriculum was seen more generally as a positive development but its content was widely criticised. Some of these criticisms focused on the control of teachers' time, rather than the quality of their teaching, the absence of important areas of learning, the lack of autonomy for teachers in implementation and the focus on parental choice rather than curricular planning. The fact that this National Curriculum did not apply directly to independent schools was also criticised in terms of how 'national' the curriculum could be (Lawton 1989b). Additionally, the allocation of time per subject was opposed by teachers for making implementation too prescriptive (Lawton 1996).

In its initial development the national testing attached to the National Curriculum was also meant to be more teacher-led. The Task Group on Assessment and Testing (TGAT), set up in 1987, recommended that assessment be age-related but also criterion-referenced. Therefore, teachers would choose some SATs from a national bank of tests to ensure continuity. At age seven, children who achieved level 1 might need special intervention but at level 3 were

deemed likely to be more advanced in that subject (Lawton 1989b). A child who achieved level 1 in a test would be working at gaining knowledge to enable them to achieve level 2 (Lawton 1989a). Instead of a year on year target, TGAT advised that broadly desirable levels should be used in relation to each two year groups and that children should be expected to make incremental progress rather than always performing at the level deemed appropriate for their chronological ages. At age 11, TGAT advocated that teachers should decide at what level a child should be assessed. The spread of achievement at age seven was expected to be broader than three levels. TGAT emphasised that "…assessment should be the servant, not the master, of the curriculum, and that it should also be [an] integral part of the educational process, providing 'feedback' and 'feedforward'" (Lawton 1989a, p.54). The teacher's role in TGAT's recommendations was to bring about change by extending beyond mere efficiency in the classroom. Teachers would need to become 'expert classroom managers', experts in both the curriculum and assessment objectives (Lawton 1989a). This form of assessment stands in direct contrast to the form actually implemented by the Conservative government, especially in relation to the involvement of teachers (Lawton 1989b). Testing in the National Curriculum raised many concerns, including the effect it had on pupils, the possibility of 'teaching to the test', the implications testing could have for relationships between teachers and parents and the focus on market-driven reform (Lawton 1989a).

The Conservative government justified its actions through both moral and political reasoning, by stating the need for parental choice and the need for national standards to be met (Stain and Simkins 2008). The education of children with SEN appeared to have been left under teachers' and LEAs' control in what was seen as a token gesture by many (The National Archive 2011). Additionally, Bines (2000) stated that there appeared to be an assumption by the Conservatives that raising standards generally would also raise the standards attained by children with SEN. It took time for the Conservatives to focus on this group of children at which point separate policies for SEN started to emerge, such as the Code of Practice 1994. Fundamentally, children with SEN did not seem to be considered within the 'public management' of schools. Parental choice meant that schools in affluent socio-economic locations were in high demand. They could opt to admit minimal numbers of children with SEN, thereby reducing their impact on key performance indicators. They could also choose children with certain types of SEN, notably those deemed easier to manage. These schools were then able to achieve higher placement in league tables and increased levels of funding from government. Schools in less affluent locations had fewer applications and had to take

more children with SEN if they were deemed capable of education in the mainstream. Without success in league tables they received fewer resources and many were placed in special measures, facing the possibility of closure (Booth *et al.,* 2003; George and Clay 2008). The socio-economic divide, represented in the league tables, perpetuated a vicious cycle in which parents applied for schools higher up the tables (Pierson 1998) leaving the less ambitious or less mobile to remain in 'sink' schools.

In 1990-97 the new leader of the Conservative party, John Major, had to deal with many inconsistencies in the Education Reform Act (1988). Little was known about John Major's political position when he became leader (Chitty 2009) but Lawton (1992) has suggested that some of the changes made by Major's predecessor were irreversible and decisions had to be made on what could be reversed and what had to remain and be developed further. Additionally, Chitty (2009) described the pressure from some Conservative party members for a period of calm and consistency in educational reform. Major appeared to share many of Thatcher's views, including the drive to eradicate comprehensive schooling. This was not unexpected. Benn and Chitty (1996) considered the Conservative party to have been committed, historically, to an 'academic and economic elite', supported by means of a competitive system covering all schools. These two objectives, according to Chitty, are not always compatible. John Major sought greater accountability in relation to standards in schools but, interestingly, in a speech for the Centre for Policy Studies in 1991 he described his policies as designed to foster a 'classless society' (Lawton 1991). As Seldon (1997, p.40) noted

> He saw himself as the champion of the child from the ordinary home; and his determination that the state school system should meet the needs of all its students spurred on his pursuit of more national curriculum testing and the publication of league tables.

In 1992 the White Paper *'Choice and Diversity: a new framework for schools'* emphasised the need for greater parental choice, greater accountability and autonomy for schools and higher quality in them (Chitty 2009). The paper critiqued the comprehensive reform for incorrectly assuming that children have the same educational needs. Instead, education should focus on individual ability and local circumstances, including the school's socio-economic location. The 1992 White Paper and the Education Act (1993) endeavoured to

increase the number of grant-maintained schools. Chitty (2009) saw this philosophical position as blurring the boundaries between public and private schools. By 1997 there was a divided secondary education system with 164 grammar schools and 1,155 schools that had decided to opt out and become grant-maintained.

John Major also held traditional Conservative beliefs regarding parental choice and school competition (Chitty 2009). By publishing SATs results to produce league tables he further influenced 'consumers' and in turn increased the pressure on 'producers' to conform (Adnett and Davies 2005). Barker (2008, p.672) detailed this approach as a "coercive, top-down compliance driven system". Kenneth Baker viewed teachers' sceptical position on testing as a reflection on their own practice. He said:

> Far too many teachers were suspicious of testing because, despite its diagnostic function, it might also reflect badly upon their own teaching ability, and would, moreover, highlight one school's performance relative to another with a similar pupil intake.

(Chitty 2002, p.70).

However, John Major defended his educational objectives by stating that they were right for parents and therefore should be undertaken. He said:

> When it comes to education, my critics say I am, 'old-fashioned', old fashioned? Reading and writing? Spelling and sums? Great literature and standard English grammar? Old fashioned? Tests and tables? British history? A proper grading in science? Discipline and self-respect? Old-fashioned? Well, if I'm old-fashioned so be it. So are the vast majority of British parents. And I have this message for the progressives who are trying to change exams, English examinations should be about literature, not soap opera.

(Chitty and Simon 1993).

Margaret Thatcher, now on the sidelines, believed that Major's developments were extensions of Thatcherism. She said in a post-election Newsweek (Thatcher 1992, p.54/55)

> I don't accept the idea that, all of a sudden, John Major is his own man. He has been Prime Minister for just 17 months, and he inherited all those great achievements of the past eleven and a half years which have fundamentally changed Britain, ridding it of the deliberating, negative aspect of Socialism… There isn't such a thing as Majorism. There couldn't be at the moment. My colleagues and I turned round the whole philosophy of government. We restored the strength and reputation of Britain.

However, in 1993, teachers boycotted tests at Key Stage 1 and 2 and this led to the national curriculum being revised somewhat in the Dearing Report (1993). Following Dearing there were attempts to advocate best practice in tracking pupils' learning. Dearing's work highlighted the importance of teacher involvement. Lawton (1996, p.96) cited Dearing as recommending that "the work of slimming down the statutory content of the programmes of study, must, however, include teachers and head teachers [so] that the new curricula can be grounded in the realities of the classroom and school planning and management". The Report advocated allocating teachers more time and emphasised the need for a school curriculum that extended beyond the National Curriculum. However, it did not resolve the issue of whether the National Curriculum should be a broad offer that children were entitled to, or a narrow core curriculum (Lawton 1996). The DFE (1995) further emphasised the assessment of children at classroom level, producing a document that described the use of value-added measures of achievement. The term value-added meant the amount of knowledge acquired by a child from one age to another. These value-added measurements could be tracked across a pupil's time in school and also across the wider school population. This form of measuring pupil achievement meant that socio-economic effects on performance would not hinder schools' assessment, as schools would be compared on the basis of what they achieved from the starting point of admission and not across locations.

New Labour: The election of the Labour party and its contribution to the standards agenda

Pierson (1998) described how, over time, Labour moderated its position on accountability and assessment, distancing itself from close identification with teacher unions. Tony Blair (2008) said that the general public had become uncertain about the Conservatives' changes,

particularly in claims to increase the academic success of all children. As Labour evolved into New Labour, it developed a new stance based on the notion of a successful economy based on a strong society of individuals with a duty to each other. Instead of making vast political changes, New Labour endeavoured to incorporate a focus on equality and social justice alongside knowledge and education (Bines 2000). Chitty (2002, p.91) described a new political choice between "a failed Conservative government, exhausted and divided in everything, other than its desire to cling on to power and a new and revitalised Labour party". Between 1994-1997, Tony Blair and his new Shadow Secretary for Education, David Blunkett, worked on the party's position on education. In 1995 New Labour produced its first education policy document entitled, *'Diversity and Excellence: A new Partnership for Schools*'. For Chitty (2009) the title of this paper could as easily have come from the Conservative party. The policy document advocated three types of schools, rejecting 'comprehensives' it promoted the development of community, aided and foundation schools. In this document grammar schools would only be closed if parents supported the move, which infuriated many New Labour members. By 1997 it was clear that New Labour wanted to continue many of the Conservative party's policies, including the focus on parental choice and accountability through school competition. Whitty (2002, p.127) said

> In practice, though, many of New Labour's changes to the Conservative agenda were largely cosmetic. In some of its manifestations, New Labour's so-called Third Way looked remarkably similar to quasi-markets. The central thrust of the policies was probably closer to that of the Conservative agenda than to Labour's traditional approach.

Moreover, the Green paper *'Building on Success; Raising Standards, Promoting Diversity, Achieving Results'* (2001) focused on 'modernising' comprehensive schools as part of New Labour's 'post-comprehensive era' (Chitty 2009).

In the run up to the 1997 general election, New Labour prioritised education in its manifesto, with Tony Blair publicly declaring a focus on 'education, education, education.' His aim was to 'modernise' the education system while keeping the focus on standards and assessment. Labour won with a landslide victory, securing 43% of the national vote (Chitty 2009).

There were notably similar core values in both the New Labour and Conservative parties' implementation of the standards agenda. New Labour embraced the need for education

marketisation as society's best route to prosperity. It also acknowledged the need to control the work undertaken by teachers. Gunter (2008) said that an approach was adopted that was similar to that of the Conservatives. In the era of Thatcherism, teachers who implemented standards objectives effectively were seen as 'one of us' (Young 1989). Similarly, Blair wanted teachers to want to be in the 'big tent' or 'on the sofa' with his government's objectives (Hyman 2005). In effect, there was no neutral metaphor for opponents to these objectives; teachers were either with New Labour or against it (Gunter 2008).

Ball (2008) saw the Conservatives' Educational Reform (1988) as a backward step in education, whilst others saw it as the precursor of New Labour's post-1997 strategies (Strain and Simkins 2008). David Blunkett said (DfEE 1997)

> To overcome economic and social disadvantage and to make equality of opportunity a reality, we must strive to eliminate, and never excuse, under-achievement in the most deprived parts of our country... We must overcome the spiral of disadvantage in which alienation from, or failure within, the education system is passed from one generation to the next.

It appeared, according to Strain and Simkins (2008), that the change in government had increased pressure to conform over standards. The Excellence in Schools (1997) White Paper imposed strict targets for government, LEAs, schools and also teachers (Chitty 2002). The DfEE was to become more pro-active in promoting standards through the use of the Standards and Effectiveness Unit and of the Standards Task Force, led by Michael Barber (Chitty 2009). Batterson (1999) stated that the New Labour government developed the National Curriculum so that it was even more prescriptive, especially in literacy and numeracy. According to Chitty (2008) all other areas of the curriculum were downgraded and marginalised. In 2002, Mike Tomlinson, former Chief Inspector of Schools said that the curriculum was being dissolved to focus on literacy and numeracy (Chitty 2009). Chitty noted a marked deterioration in curriculum quality due to this narrowing of its content and the focus on assessment and standards. The party's sights were set firmly on schools being accountable through national league tables and schools were left to concentrate further on summative assessments, such as SATs. Ainley (2004) remarked that the Conservatives' 'blaming and shaming' of schools continued with the New Labour government. A General Teaching Council was established to raise standards, with procedures put in place to remove

incompetent teachers. New Labour also established 'zero tolerance' of under-achievement for schools that failed to meet the standards government desired. Those who could not improve would be closed down (Chitty 2002). Successful schools were given more freedom, allowing them to expand their pupil intake, whilst failing schools had stricter measures and targeted support. New Labour also further redefined teachers' professionalism as 'reform implementation' and head teachers were instructed to be implementers (Gunter 2008). Their workload effectively came to consist of time spent on standards implementation and their opportunities to work on pupils' learning became 'time for standards' (Fisher 2008; Gunter 2008). In turn, New Labour intensified its control of teachers and expected a 'can do' attitude (Fisher 2008). The party's Excellence in Schools (1997) White Paper said "we must replace a culture of complacency with commitment to success" (Education in England 2013).

New Labour attempted to promote a 'third way' perspective which was neither completely right or left, but was a creative partnership of 'what works' (Lawton 1992), while emphasising a commitment to increase equity and social justice within the school system (Blair 2008). Tony Blair emphasised the party's ideology as one of ethical socialism, in which society is committed to promoting the needs of the individual (Chitty 2009). Chitty (2002) viewed this political position as 'centre and centre-left'. A slogan developed that incorporated elements of both equality and standards – "High quality education for the many rather than excellence for the few" (Whitty 2008; p.171). New Labour wanted to 'raise the bar' and 'close the gap' in attainment between children from advantaged and disadvantaged backgrounds (Strain and Simkins 2008). As such it sought to recognise the importance of delivering a differentiated education in comprehensive schools, emphasising such statements as "…children are not all the same ability; nor do they learn at the same speed. That means 'setting' children in classes to maximise progress, for the benefit of 'high fliers' and slower learners alike. The focus must be a levelling up, not levelling down" (Chitty 2002, p.92). The emphasis was on standards over structures and no 'good school' would be closed down. Grant-maintained schools would continue to run, but with funding that did not unfairly advantage them compared to other schools. This was done in an attempt to establish fairness in funding across secondary schools (Chitty 2002).

The Inclusion agenda: New Labour's development of integration

New Labour termed its election in 1997 the 'zero year', from which it would be able to change the education system and ensure school success. However, Chitty (2006) states that its education objectives should not be seen as 'progressive' or 'enlightening.' The party turned its back on its social democratic values and also on its commitment to comprehensive reform. While New Labour had never unanimously agreed with comprehensive schooling it sought to re-energise the system and provide greater diversity in the schools offered (Chitty 2012). However, there were also members of the party, such as Roy Hattersley (Deputy party leader 1983-92), who believed that New Labour should never have abandoned its social democratic ideological position. Nevertheless there was a belief that comprehensive schools had failed and that the future of secondary education was to provide greater diversity and more privileges for specific schools (Chitty 2006). Schools could decide whether they wanted to acquire trust status, like that of funded academies or become self-governed and, in this development, Chitty (2006) believed that New Labour created a 'bewildering array' of secondary schools. The promise of more freedom for trust schools in areas such as the curriculum appeared to be deceptive, as these freedoms already existed in foundation schools. The 2004 Five Year Strategy for Children White Paper made no mention of 'human educability' which was seen as important in the development of comprehensive schooling. A statement in this paper also categorised children in ways that directly countered the ethos of comprehensive schooling. The new categories were "the gifted and talented, the struggling and the just average" (Chitty, p.40). In effect New Labour failed to reverse the Conservatives' attack on a nationwide comprehensive education system (Chitty 2012). While it moved away from the development of comprehensive schools, a large number of comprehensive schools continued to exist and many academies were proud to say that they retained their comprehensive intake (Chitty 2006).

Academies were introduced to promote high standards, replacing schools deemed as 'failures' (Gorard 2005). The City Academy Programme, launched in 2000 was extended so that any failing school could become an academy and be taken over by private, voluntary or faith groups. Successful academies would benefit from greater autonomy, including in the implementation of the curriculum (Tomlinson 2005) although, in practice, Chitty (2009) said that New Labour restricted academies' curriculum autonomy. Whitty (2002, p.137) said "New Labour often seemed to demand that academies were either with the government 100

per cent or they were regarded as against it". This led, according to Whitty, to academies with little room for autonomy. In 1997 David Blunkett had said "if you are not with us then step aside for there is no room in the education service for those who do not believe we can do better" (Whitty 2002, 0.137).

David Blunkett, now Secretary of State for Education, wanted to reduce the proportion of statemented children from 3% and increase the number of children with SEN who benefited from a mainstream education (Armstrong 2005). John Dunford, General Secretary of the Association of School and College Leaders (ASCL) remarked in 2008 that New Labour had developed 'a spirit of optimism'. Its commitment to inclusion involved a need for all children's worth and potential to be recognised, regardless of ability, class, gender or ethnicity (Dunford 2007). In turn, inclusion for New Labour meant a search for a completely new education and a societal welcome and acceptance of differences (Avramidis and Norwich 2002). All children were to be fully included in every aspect of the school experience in an ongoing process of development that was designed to bring hope for the future of education (Booth *et al.,* 2000; Winter 2006). As Barton (1998b, p.16) stated "Inclusive education is not an end in itself, it is a means to an end, and that end is creating an inclusive society".

However, there was little mention of the nature or definition of inclusion in relation to education; more emphasis was again placed on mantras of 'high expectations', 'standards' and 'school improvements' (Armstrong 2005; Avramidis and Norwich 2002). Strain and Simkins (2008) noted that terms such as social inclusion can conceal power relations that obscure both responsibility and accountability. Inclusion appeared from this perspective to be intrinsically linked with the need for standards. Armstrong (2005) said that this meant a need for all children to conform within narrow parameters of success. In effect, this represented a distinctive pedagogy wherein the same teaching and standards were to be considered effective for all children. Similarly, Gamarnikow and Green (2003, p.209) said "there are, of course, winners and losers … [promoting] belief in the myth, or at least acquiescence to the rhetoric, of excellence for all - everyone's a winner".

Slee (2001, p.136) believed that there was a "deep epistemological attachment to the view that special educational needs are produced by the impaired pathology of the child". New Labour persisted with terminology that was associated directly with their ownership of

disability. It supported a separate statementing process, a p-scale system attached to the National Curriculum, separate resources and an appointed Special Educational Needs Co-ordinator (SENCO) (Corbett 1996; Sainsbury 1996; Northway 1997; Willan 1998). As a consequence, children with SEN were discussed in relation to improving standards in a similar fashion to their peers whilst also having separate specialist provisions so that they could be 'included' in mainstream settings without any negative impact on standards. However, following the *'Removing barriers to achievement'* paper (2004), New Labour did attempt to move attention away from a child's impairment to the barriers they encountered in mainstream settings. Schools were urged to adapt their provisions as part of their inclusive objectives in order to 'accommodate' children with SEN, while simultaneously retaining all of the separate provisions associated with impairment (DfEE 1997; Hodkinson and Vickerman 2009).

In 2003 Chitty (2009) said that there was a clear and widespread objection to targets at primary level. In response the 'Excellence and Enjoyment: A strategy for Primary Schools (DfES 2003) proposed greater flexibility and autonomy for teachers. However, it also insisted that this would not mean that there would be no targets for primary schools. Tests for seven year olds would be 'downgraded' to rely on teacher assessment and league table results could also include comments from Ofsted inspections on the overall quality of education (Chitty 2009). The 2003 Primary Strategy highlighted a greater need for pupil enjoyment in learning but, according to Galton (2007), it did not reconsider the emphasis on accountability and testing. Without such reconsideration teachers would not have any further flexibility or autonomy (Alexander 2004).

Before the 2005 election Tony Blair announced that he would not lead the New Labour party to another General Election. Gordon Brown replaced Blair in 2007 and led the party until 2010. Brown wanted to retain Blair's educational developments, but pursue them with 'renewed vigour', especially the development of more academies (Chitty 2009). However, in 2008 he appeared to move away from Blair's educational policies, in *Guardian* article, 'Beyond Blair'. He wanted a departure from competition between schools and also to ensure that schools could no longer 'select' the children they admitted. Brown wanted to extend Blair's educational policies by providing a third act in 'public centre reform' (Brown 2008a). For him, the first act was New Labour's 1997 emphasis on increasing standards and accountability in schools. The second was tackling underperformance in schools and the

third act was a focus on choice and diversity which could be achieved by establishing new plans that would "empower and enable more of our best headteachers to help turn around low-performing schools, that would create new trusts and federations around successful schools, and, in areas of greatest need, drive forward an even faster expansion of the Government's Academies Programme" (Brown 2008a, p.92). However, the continuation of SATs and league tables meant that schools continued to be in open competition and that accountability through assessment remained at the forefront of the standards agenda (Lawton 1992).

The Coalition and its education agendas

David Cameron and the Shadow Education Secretary, David Willets (who was later replaced by Michael Gove) made a surprising political move in 2007 by stating the party were no longer in favour of promoting grammar schools. William Hague, a former Conservative leader, wanted to see grammar schools in every region and Cameron had to concede a little to the traditional values of grammar schools within the Conservative party, instead advocating new grammar schools in areas of population growth (Chitty 2009). The Conservative party wanted to see more variety in schools and to make it easier for more academies and independent schools to exist in what resembled a steady privatisation of the secondary education system. The Conservative party emphasised that New Labour was wrong to restrict academies' curriculum autonomy and said that a small 'core curriculum' should instead be used. The Liberal Democrats set out their political standpoint in their Equality and Excellence policies for 5-19 Education in 2009. Their educational perspective was very different from those of other political parties. They emphasised the need for children to love learning and that this meant more than just literacy and numeracy. They identified tackling the performance gap, through additional funding and high quality schooling, as their main concern. In 2009 their leader, Nick Clegg, highlighted the importance of tackling social disadvantage and social mobility in education:

> We have, after 12 years of Labour, one of the most socially segregated systems of education in the world, where the circumstances of your birth determine everything from your educational attainment to the length of your life… From the moment I was elected Leader, I have made the whole issue of genuine social mobility an organising principle for us. You cannot overcome inter-generational, class-based

> deprivation unless you start young; you have to give children one to one tuition where necessary and you have to dramatically reduce class sizes.

(Chitty 2009, p. 226)

Regarding academies, the Liberal Democrats advocated three main school models, community schools, a new model of sponsor managed schools (including academies) and partnership models that linked high performing schools with those that were struggling to meet the required standards (Chitty 2009).

When the Coalition Government was established academies and independent schools came to the top of the political agenda for both parties (Chitty 2009). The Coalition said that it was determined to deliver schools that parents wanted their children to attend (Department for Education 2012a). The Academies Act (2010) developed New Labour academies into a nationwide model in both primary and secondary sectors. Academies would no longer be opened primarily in poorer areas and all schools would now have the potential to convert. Interestingly, academies have more freedom to adapt the National Curriculum, a freedom that Ed Balls withdrew during New Labour's time in power. Academies are still to be accountable within the national standards framework and, therefore, deviation from the curriculum could be difficult to achieve in practice (Goodwin 2011). Additionally, the concept of 'free schools' has been further developed, whereby independent trusts created by parents, teachers or private companies can open a school and gain funding from the Department of Education. It appears from these two concepts of different school structures that the Coalition is keen to encourage schools to become academies as well as to create free schools (Goodwin 2011). In 2011 academies represented 40% of secondary schools, and 24 free schools opened. More were planned with a specific focus on areas of deprivation (Department for Education 2012a).

The Coalition government, formed through a Conservative and Liberal Democrat collaboration since the inconclusive election in 2010, has inherited a very different economy to that enjoyed during most of New Labour's years. The last three years have seen the development of education policy that will continue to reinforce the effects of accountability, centralised control and assessment (George and Clay 2008). The Coalition has noted Britain's declining position in international league tables for educational achievement (Chitty

2009) and the Education Act (2011) claimed to be designed to help teachers raise standards, improve on underperformance and strengthen the ways in which teachers are held accountable for their actions. This act concentrated on reforms in the development of new schools, with preference given to academies and free schools (Department for Education 2012a).

In the Education Act (2011) Ofsted inspections were refocused to concentrate on educational standards and so strengthen school accountability (Department for Education 2012a). In 2011, a review of the National Curriculum was announced in which an advisory committee considered replacing the current version with one that supports international economic success. Michael Gove, Education Secretary (Department for Education 2012b, p.1) said:

> We have sunk in the international league table and the National Curriculum is substandard. Meanwhile the pace of economic and technological change is accelerating and our children are being left behind. The previous curriculum has failed to prepare us for the future.

In 2012, the Coalition announced a review of SEN, proposing a Green paper named: *Support and aspiration: a new approach to special needs and disability.* The focus of this paper is to consider changing the identification process for children with SEN so that there is a single early years setting/school-based category. A single assessment process has been proposed for use across education and healthcare by 2014, with added support for parental choice in deciding upon either mainstream or special schooling. For children with SEN it seems that the focus of Coalition reform is on identification and assessment to inform initial placement.

Summarising the political perspective of the inclusion and standards agendas

The inclusion and standards agendas in education were developed by different political parties at times of great social change. The standards agenda was initiated by the Labour government with Callaghan's Ruskin College speech but was extensively implemented by the Conservatives with an emphasis on the party's marketisation approach (Chitty 1989; Kavanagh 1987). Teachers' and LEAs' autonomy was reduced and conformity was expected in the implementation of a National Curriculum and assessment process. Following the Education Reform Act (1988) the Conservative government continued to emphasise

standards and accountability by introducing concepts such as SATs and national league tables (Gorard 2005).

The inclusion agenda evolved from the era of integration; they were introduced under Labour/New Labour but were also augmented by the Conservative government. This agenda was rooted philosophically in equality and social justice and the right of all children to have an education (Chitty 1989; Whitty 2008). Its objectives were more sympathetic to the growing diversity in teachers' classrooms. More recent historical developments in defining inclusion have endeavoured to cover all children in every aspect of the school experience (Boot *et al.*, 2000). Whilst the standards agenda centralised power over teachers and LEAs, integration, and in turn inclusion, sought collaboration with teachers and LEAs, giving them responsibilities and autonomy for implementation (George and Clay 2008; Booth *et al.*, 2000) and teachers were left to implement inclusion objectives as far as possible (Winter 2006). In fact, very little government guidance was offered on potential barriers to inclusion; neither was there much advice on effective inclusive practice (Clough 2000).

New Labour (1997) largely chose to retain the Conservatives' standards agenda and in fact, made its objectives even more prescriptive (Batterson 1999). At the same time, it sought the inclusion of all children, particularly those with SEN, into mainstream settings (Booth *et al.*, 2000). It would appear that these two agendas, holding different educational concepts, were merged as New Labour attempted to amalgamate social justice with measures of accountability and achievement. So far the Coalition government has continued to support the dominance of the standards agenda in education discourse (Goodwin 2011).

Literature review - <u>Teacher identity; the influence of government objectives on developing professional identities</u>

An historical outlook on society's views of teachers and their perceived professional identities

Teacher professionalism can be seen as a social construction, whereby perceptions of teachers as professionals have changed according to the societal needs of the era (Johnson 1972). It is seen as a 'relational phenomenon' that can be situated and influenced by society. Consequently, there have been historically competing views of teacher professionalism and this has led to the term being one of the most historically contested issues of teaching to date (Beijaard *et al.,* 2000). The term 'professional' has always described teachers as 'emblematic figures': as Stronach and his colleagues (2002, p.111) state they are "reduced to a singular meaning… and simultaneously inflated to improbable symbolic importance". This creates the sense of a 'harassed' profession, in which teachers appear to have to change their identities as teachers on a regular basis to accommodate fluctuating societal positions on their profession. Carr-Saunders (1928, p.110) suggests:

> The growth of professionalism is one of the hopeful features of the time. The approach to problems of social conduct and social policy under the guidance of a professional tradition raises the ethical standard and widens the social outlook.

Understandably, this has meant that teachers have had continually to reinvent not only their identities, but also the role they have as teachers. According to Rutty (1998) each differing use of professionalism brings with it another descriptor linking teaching professionalism to the needs of contemporary society. This is evident in Hargreaves' (2000) research on the development of teacher professionalism through history. Hargreaves (2000) observes that teachers have not always been seen as professionals. The development of teacher autonomy and, in turn, professionalism was seen as a necessity by Waller, who was a pioneering educational academic (1932, p.111). He wrote, "the school must stop trying to become a machine and strive to realise its destiny as a social organism". However, it was not until the 1960s and 1970s that teachers achieved the pinnacle of high, socially accepted professional status.

The ‘collegial teachers’ of the recent past saw the diversity of the children in their classes extended. Children from a broader mix of cultures and abilities were then integrated into co-educational mainstream schools (Banks 1981; Hargreaves 2000; Kailin 2002; Mason 2000). The Warnock Report (1978) fundamentally increased the diversity of mainstream classrooms by integrating children with SEN had an important role in establishing teachers’ professional status (Croll and Moses 2003; Mason 2000). The ‘collegial’ age saw teachers having power and authority to determine the educational needs of their classes. With this increased responsibility came a greater societal trust in teachers and they were granted high public status, based upon their knowledge and expertise (Hargreaves 1994). There was a broad consensus amongst teachers as a professional body that education provided a ‘social service’ (Hanlon 1998).

With the onset of marketisation, and the competition to improve according to externally determined educational standards, the teacher’s role rapidly changed, demanding conformity within a strict set of governmental guidelines. Left without the autonomy they once knew, teachers were now held accountable for their actions by a public managerial system (Clarke and Newman 1997). Consequently, Stronach and his colleagues (2002, p.115) state “the political conflict relocates the centre of debate outside the profession itself, leaving the professionals mere spectators”. A competitive ethos emerged between schools and between teachers and the previous unity of teachers as a profession became fragmented. Teachers were de-professionalised, their practical knowledge no longer seen as enough to grant them professional status (Carlgren 1999). While they were in a sense deskilled, their workload once more became intensified (Sachs 2001).

Ball (1999, p.1) says

> the combination of market and performative reforms bites deep into the practice of teachers and into the teacher’s soul- into the ‘classroom life’ and world of imagination of the teacher- specific and diverse aspects of conduct are reworked and the locus of control over the selection of pedagogies and curricula is shifted.

A new ‘commercialised’ teacher professionalism emerged in which teachers were seen as professionals if they met standardised criteria and they contributed to schools’ accountable achievements (Brennan 1996; Webb *et al.,* 2004). Teachers were now required to earn their

professional status through adherence to the standards agenda. Professionalism became intrinsically linked to a performance model of delivery for vocational knowledge (Sachs 2001). Whilst Poulson (1998) states that most people believe in the need for educational accountability, Day's (2002) findings indicate that in the long term the drive to raise achievement according to pre-determined standards seems to lower teachers' capability to teach. Inevitably, this could be said to have changed teachers into technicians, instead of practitioners, in a socially embedded discourse that had not changed in two decades (Adams and Tulasiewicz 1995).

Teacher identity and agency

Earlier research in the field of identity investigated singular-unified concepts of the self which remain consistent throughout an individual's lifetime of experiences. Bandura's (2001) social cognitive theory considered individuals to be autonomous agents in their own decision making. Moving away from the behaviourist view that individuals were conditioned and controlled by their environment, Bandura believed that individuals had autonomy in their own actions.

Alongside social cognitive theory Bandura (1997) developed the idea that individuals need to retain self-efficacy with concepts of self. Bandura believed that self-efficacy serves as a mediator between the self and the outside world (Miller and Major 2000). Bandura (2001, p.83) stated that control of externally driven mechanisms comes from individuals and their cognitive processes. He said "self-efficacy theory positions the self as the centre and originator of change, beginning with control over belief systems, which determine levels of performance". Bandura believed that individuals' self-efficacy beliefs were stable and guided them during any environmental changes. How individuals reacted to these changes depended on whether they possessed high or low levels of self-efficacy.

Bandura defined those with high self-efficacy as possessing belief in their own power to change their environment through their own actions. These individuals are seen to be self-directed, persevering with their actions and remaining optimistic in the face of pressing situational demands. In contrast, he determined that individuals with low self-efficacy believe they do not possess this control and doubt every action that they take. These individuals are seen to reduce their efforts to act independently in response to increasing

environmental changes (Bandura 2001). In relation to teachers and their identities it appears from Bandura's self-efficacy theory that individuals possess or not possess these cognitive processes depending on their level of self-efficacy. Without a high level of self-efficacy teachers will not be able to acknowledge their own professional autonomy in relation to any governmental agenda.

Becoming a teacher: the complexity of developing one's professional identity

Becoming a teacher is seen by McNally and colleagues (2008) as a journey of self-discovery, wherein a revised personal self is developed and, within it, teacher identity is formed. In doing so, according to these theorists, the self accommodates knowledge from training and from colleagues in the pre-service stage of a teaching career (Atay 2007). However, this journey is fraught with emotion, both anxiety and delight, and it is this labour of emotion that is seen to be a pre-service teacher's investment in developing professional identities. In fact, this perceived personal struggle is seen as a challenge as to whether individuals can adapt and take on a professional identity (McNally *et al.*, 2008). McNally and colleagues (2008, p.290) determined that it takes pre-service teachers several weeks of emotional turmoil to find a sense of "ontological security". However, Day and colleagues (2006) state that this is only achieved by teachers keeping their personal and professional identities as separate entities during pre-service and in the early stages of their careers. For these academics, it is not until the second decade of teaching that teachers have matured their identities sufficiently to intrinsically associate their personal and professional selves.

Therefore, Day and colleagues (2006) see the formation of an individual's professional identity as being neither fragmented nor completely stable. By focusing upon both individual capacity and the social systems in which they teach, their research determines that professional identities are complex and ever-changing. As such, human agency cannot be disconnected from the mediated effects of, for example, educational reforms (Lasky 2005). Effectively, these complex identities exist between the 'structure' of meditating agents and the 'agency' of individuals' ability to influence and make changes (Day *et al.*, 2006). These theorists focus on circumstances that change throughout a teacher's career stages, including their personal lives and professional situational factors (Ball and Goodson 1985). In fact Cooper and Olsen (1996) view teachers as having varying identities that are continuously reconstructed according to historical, cultural, sociological and psychological influences.

Day and colleagues (2006) state that teachers not only reflect upon their past and current experiences, both personally and socially, they also consider their own personal future expectations, how they hope to develop as teachers in the light of changing political, social and personal circumstances. Kukkonen (2005) views these identities separately as: the 'actual' self (one currently prevailing), the 'ought' self (e.g. recognised by individuals but set by the government) and the 'ideal' self (one identified by the individual as possibly achievable). The emotions felt by teachers in such instances are said to be heightened and intrinsically connected to core beliefs and the context of the situation (Lasky 2000). Kelchtermans (1996) proposed that such emotions can produce vulnerability in individuals. This vulnerability can either be positive in terms of opening up to learning, or negative when long-held principles are challenged, particularly when trust in teachers' capabilities is in question. In these circumstances feelings of powerlessness, inefficiency, betrayal and the need to defend one's actions can produce high levels of anxiety and individuals may then withdraw to protect themselves (Lasky 2005).

Cognitive dissonance; strategies used when an individual has two or more positions on one given subject

Festinger (1957) developed the theory of cognitive dissonance to describe a "state of tension that occurs whenever a person holds two or more cognitions (ideas, attitudes, beliefs, opinions) that are psychologically inconsistent" (Tavris and Aronson 2007, p.13). Festinger (1957) believed that individuals strive for consistency, but that there are frequent circumstances where individuals can hold more than one position on a given subject. In doing so, they would then attempt to reduce the dissonance in their cognitions to achieve consonance. Dissonance is represented in the differences in an individual's cognitions. Therefore, cognitive dissonance "can be seen as an antecedent condition which leads to activity orientated toward dissonance reduction". However, dissonance can persist so that consonance cannot be achieved and this produces mental discomfort in varying degrees from "minor pangs to deep anguish" (Tavris and Aronson 2007, p.13). According to Goffman (1959) individuals are best regarded as a 'social hybrid', capable of apparent tensions between their personal and professional beliefs. Teachers may therefore encounter cognitive dissonance between their personal self and professional identities, which has an impact on practical implementation (Day *et al.*, 2006).

According to Festinger (1957) cognitive dissonance can occur in response to a circumstance where individuals have the choice either to retain their personal self-beliefs or to adapt to accommodate a social position. In order to retain their beliefs, Festinger predicted that individuals will actively engage with literature or with other people supporting the same cognitive beliefs. In doing so, their original personal self is justified and their dissonance reduced. For example, teachers who believe that inclusion of children with SEN should depend on their impairment will seek information that confirms their beliefs. These teachers are then able to justify why they disagree with this element of the inclusion agenda. In contrast, individuals can 'reconcile' the difference between their personal selves and professional identities. This requires individuals to moderate their beliefs but, in doing so, consonance can result. Teachers could 'reconcile' such difference by determining that the inclusion agenda is directed by the government and that, whilst they may not necessarily believe fully in its objectives, they have to acknowledge it professionally. Interestingly, Festinger goes on to state that an individual's differing cognitions can have both positive and negative aspects that may be used in determining the paths they have chosen. Teachers may see providing accountability across schools as a positive aspect of the standards agenda but may not agree with that agenda's objectives. By determining a positive representation of the cognitions in opposition to their personal selves, consonance can be found.

Festinger also notes that there are occasions where forced compliance occurs in social situations. In effect individuals are forced to behave in a manner contrary to their personal self-beliefs and are subject to punishment and reward. These circumstances may go unremarked, as individuals may only be willing to highlight such discrepancies if they are guaranteed anonymity in their responses. According to Festinger, forced compliance can eventually lead to personal acceptance. If this is the case, individuals may change both their personal beliefs and their behaviour to correspond with forced compliance. In such instances, dissonance may completely disappear. It is possible that, if teachers feel forced to implement the standards or inclusion agendas, they will completely change their personal self-beliefs in order to do so effectively without suffering the consequences of dissonance.

However, Festinger also states that individuals with such constraints can retain their personal selves and disassociate them from their enacted behaviours. As such, if teachers feel that they are forced to implement either agenda against their beliefs, they may retain those

personal beliefs, but separate them from their professional identities. In doing so, Festinger determines that consonance can occur separately for both positions and can be associated with any reward or punishment. Teachers may then retain their personal self-beliefs but, as professionals, implement initiatives they do not believe in. Consonance can then be achieved by reflecting solely on professional identities and determining that these are the basis on which they are measured and, in a sense, 'rewarded' as teachers.

Tavris and Aronson (2007) associated Festinger's cognitive dissonance with their theory of self-justification. They argue that the need for consonance is so powerful that individuals will adapt any social information to retain their developed consonance. In effect, justification for one's own actions occurs by distorting social information that appears to be contrary to one's view; this is deemed as 'confirmation bias'. Therefore, even if information against one's developed consonance emerges socially, individuals can use this information to support their consonance further. In doing so, dissonance is not increased and individuals are able to justify their actions and retain consonance, regardless of the new social information. If these theories hold true we might expect that, once teachers have achieved consonance between their personal self and professional identities in any given circumstance, they will distort any further information to justify their own actions. Such self-justification is "designed to serve our need to feel good about what we have done, what we believe and who we are" (Tavris and Aronson 2007 p.39).

Teachers' positions on the inclusion and standards agendas

In the limited research studies on teachers' positions on the inclusion agenda, teachers predominantly hold a pragmatic position concerning inclusion. In doing so, they appear personally to believe in the ideal of inclusion while, as professionals, simultaneously thinking it cannot be implemented fully (Avramidis *et al.*, 2000; Croll and Moses 2003). One of the key contributors to these pragmatic positions appears to be the confusion felt in determining a definition of inclusion. Lacey (2001) found that teachers in her research were describing what they believed was inclusion, when what they actually detailed was integration. Clough (1991) researched 1000 mainstream teachers' SEN perspectives on integration in four LEAs. In one of these LEAs, half of the teachers were committed to integrative policies; in the other three, between a quarter and one third were similarly committed. Interestingly, in 1997, Clough returned to four of the schools and found that in two there was no change in positive

attitudes while, in the other two, positive attitudes had diminished. At a time when inclusion was emerging in mainstream schools Clough (1998, p.13) found resistance. He said:

> I say 'with genuine regret' because I know these schools well; I spent hundreds of hours among their pupils, classrooms and staff in 1990-1 and saw at close hand the fine detail of their lived commitment to integration systems. Some six years later I see the same teachers reaching for justifications to exclude the same pupils whose interests they were vigorously supporting, often against their own instincts and professional training- but with proper resources.

Throughout studies considering teachers' positions on inclusion there appear to be three variables that contribute towards the development of these pragmatic positions: the child, the teacher and the environment (Avramidis *et al.,* 2000; Brown *et al.,* 2002). The child variable represents a difference in position on inclusion depending upon a child's individual characteristics, seen as a deficit. The majority of teachers within these studies viewed children with physical impairments as being easier to include in mainstream schools (Avramidis and Norwich 2002; Croll 2001; Croll and Moses 2003). Environmental variables highlight practical barriers faced by these teachers, including lack of learning support assistants (Avramidis and Norwich 2002; Avramidis *et al.,* 2000). Teachers in these studies believed that in order to make inclusion work there needed to be better staff/pupil ratios and more time allocated to each individual child (Avramidis *et al.,* 2000; Avramidis and Norwich 2002). Finally, teacher related variables were barriers the teachers felt they professionally faced. For instance, teachers mentioned the need for more training and experience in order to develop a more positive position on inclusion (Avramidis and Norwich 2002; Reynolds 2001). It appeared that many of these teachers felt ill-prepared and unsupported for the task of inclusion (Avramidis and Norwich 2002; Sikes *et al.,* 2007).

Ainscow and colleagues (2006, p.100) researched 25 schools and their positions on developing inclusion alongside improving standards. They found that schools' approaches were influenced by conforming to the standards agenda. Interestingly, they discovered that these schools viewed the difficulties they encountered as coming from within the child and from their families and community experiences. Ainscow and colleagues stated that these schools found both flexibility and constraint within the agendas.

> … the government's agendas were themselves seen to be marked by deep ambiguities- at one and the same time both liberating and constraining, opening up new possibilities and shepherding children back into well-trodden and problematic paths.

However, the constraints of the standards agenda are primarily focused within teachers' attitudes to it. Bowers (2004) found that his teachers felt they had little room to make their own decisions on any aspect of standards objectives. Research on the National Curriculum shows that it is mainly seen as ignoring individualised learning. Pollard *et al.* (1994) said that research on primary school teachers shows that they generally want to consider learning beyond the constraints of curriculum, thinking of the 'whole' child. In comparison Harnett and Newman (2002) found that a high percentage of primary teachers considered children's achievements to be outside the curriculum. The teachers in their research were committed to providing a broad and balanced curriculum, but also emphasised the need for children to be happy and to enjoy learning.

When considering the SAT objectives teachers appear predominantly to feel forced to conform and to believe that they have to 'prep' their children, focusing solely on academic achievement (Fieldings *et al.,* 1999; Wyse and Torrance 2009). Additionally, West and colleagues (1997) stated that teachers found the SATs process to be time-consuming, with a detrimental increase to their workload. A minority of teachers, according to Brown and colleagues (1997), opposed the use of publicly measured tests; however most viewed them as fulfilling a moderation role. Research by Brown *et al.* (1997) and West *et al* (1997) showed that teachers believed more emphasis should be placed on teacher assessment. However, Brown *et al.* (1997) found that teachers wanted SAT results to be combined with teacher assessment. These teachers had concerns regarding the validity of SATs, particularly when considering all children. Teachers in West *et al.* (1997) specifically highlighted that the SAT process did not reflect the attainment of children with SEN. These teachers considered the learning experiences of children with SEN who do not take part in SATs and said that they were not being taught during the period in which tests are being prepared for in schools. For these teachers the SAT process does not cater for all children or for all children's educational achievements.

With regard to Ofsted, Chapman (2002) found that teachers experienced inspections as barriers rather than facilitators to improvement. Consequently, it appeared that they saw the

process as an indicative snapshot account of their schools, generating both stress and a lack of job satisfaction. Brown *et al.* (2002) found that the implementation of the standards agenda was the predominant factor leading to a rise in the numbers of teachers leaving the profession. Furthermore, Quick and Quick (1984) found that some teachers suffered occupational stress as a direct consequence of standards agenda objectives. Consequently, they believe that this occupational stress has a profound effect on teaching, such as poorer teaching performance and teacher absenteeism. Teachers appear from these studies to feel 'entrapped' in a system where they have no choice but to conform and where they feel under-valued as professionals (Yarker 2006).

Summarising teacher identity in relation to education policy

Carr-Saunders (1928) suggests that teachers have to continuously re-invent themselves, according to changes in the education system. With the implementation of the standards agenda in particular, Webb and colleagues (2004) have said that teacher identities have changed to that of the 'commercialised teacher' where the focus is on meeting accountable standards. In effect, as Adams and Tulasiewicz (1995) say, teachers have moved from being practitioners to being technicians who now solely implement government objectives. However, Bandura (2001) contended that individuals' personal traits and attributes have an impact upon implementing any objective. Teachers may then implement the inclusion and standards agendas differently according to their own personal attributes.

McNally *et al* (2008) describe the struggle taken by teachers to develop their professional identities. In turn, Day *et al.* (2006) say that teachers can take over a decade to harmonise their personal and professional identities. It would appear that teachers can adapt their professional identities according to changes in educational reform (Lasky 2005). Past experiences, along with future expectations, appear to influence changing and complex professional identities (Day *et al.*, 2006). Considering Festinger's (1957) theory, these identities can be so complex that sustain conflicting personal and professional positions on a given subject. In circumstances of forced compliance, teachers may separate their personal and professional positions in order to protect their personal beliefs and to resolve dissonance in their actions.

From studies conducted on teachers' positions on the inclusion agenda it seems that the flexibility of objectives facilitates various pragmatic positions, currently discussed as one unified individual position (Avramidis and Norwich 2002). Studies based on the standards agenda present teachers as struggling to conform to inclusion objectives. As such, these studies have focused on dissatisfaction with the objectives and have limited data on how teachers negotiate them in practice (Fielding *et al.*, 1999). Their justification for the strategies they use may become clearer once their positions regarding identities and influences are acknowledged. Consideration of the individual teacher and the formation of teacher identity will contribute to considering how teachers negotiate the inclusion and standards agendas in tandem.

Methodology

In this study I chose to use Q-methodology not only as my initial data collection method, but as a framework for thinking about research. Q-methodology can be used to investigate the complexity of differing participants' positions where differences of opinion are expected (Combes *et al.,* 2004), in this case primary school teachers' positions on education policy and practice. Q-method can provide in-depth qualitative data associated with social influences in a measurable form (Eden *et al.,* 2005). The use of subjectivity is of great importance in this methodology, allowing participants the freedom to express their positions. A 'concourse' of 48 statements was developed from literature on both the inclusion and standards agendas and 26 primary teachers then ranked these statements onto a quasi-normal distribution grid, shaped as an inverted pyramid, firstly for the inclusion agenda and then the standards agenda (Brown; 1995; McKeown and Thomas 1988). This process is a qualiquantological approach as it can produce qualitative data alongside the use of developing factors of opinion using statistical data (Brown 1996; Stenner, Dancey and Watts 2000). To enhance the qualitative data produced by the Q-sort process, I used report sheets on which teachers described why they placed statements in the most extreme distribution columns. Following analysis of the data I conducted post Q-sort semi-structured interviews with eight of the original teachers to further extend the qualitative data, particularly in considering the agendas simultaneously. In these interviews I initially used factor statements influenced by Stainton-Rogers and Stainton-Rogers (1990). Teachers in these interviews were asked to consider subjectively which factor they felt best represented their position on the agenda. This data influenced the semi-structured nature of the remaining interview.

Positioning myself as a researcher

According to Schostak (2002, p.8) it is necessary in research to locate "one's 'self', one's 'ground', one's 'horizon', in relation to the great debates, the great events of a given period of time that the project may be found". Schostak (2002, p.8) believes that knowledge is constructed according to one's position as a researcher; without a clear position researchers are "little more than puppets dangling from their strings, blown by cross-currents". Burton and Bartlett (2009) contend that such positioning is largely influenced by past personal experiences. Therefore, before I started my research I felt compelled thoroughly to analyse my position as a researcher. Schostak (2002) states that researchers consider their positions

on the very nature of knowledge and beliefs of human and societal purposes. In doing so, the search for a position as a researcher can elicit many questions about beliefs concerning 'knowing who I am in relation to others'. This was the case for me. I had really to consider my own taken-for-granted assumptions in order to determine my position as a researcher. The main belief system I had to address was my ideological commitment to inclusion. I had to distance myself as much as possible from this belief in order to view inclusion fairly from the positions of others.

Cohen *et al.* (2011) stated that a researcher's ontological position represents their understanding of 'reality'. Burton and Bartlett (2009) proposed that some researchers can view the social world as disassociated from their own actions so that individual positions are fixed and clearly defined, a proposition which is well respected in fields such as natural science and psychology. Cohen *et al.* (2007) also said that when this happens the social world imposes itself upon individuals and that these researchers may become oblivious of the action of the social world. Researchers who have a sociological perspective may believe that individuals determine their actions within the social world. They therefore construct their knowledge from social contexts and accept that their positions are informed by those of others, by the environment and by personal experience. My ontological position as a researcher sits better within this second perspective: belief in researcher neutrality is unsafe and one's positions and actions can alter over time. Therefore, as a researcher, I recognise that I am partial and need to work as openly as possible, focusing on the positions of my participants.

Burton and Bartlett (2009) say that a researcher's ontological and epistemological positions help to determine how research will be conducted. A researcher's epistemological perspective is associated with their beliefs of the 'theory of knowledge'. As Benton and Craib (2001, p.17) have said, this theory determines "how knowledge is created and what is seen to be legitimate knowledge". Schostak (2002, p.8) advocates the need for researchers to reflect upon research paradigms to "secure in their dominance of particular geographically defined territories, find their 'space' and their 'world…" Research paradigms are conceptual frameworks that can elucidate the link between researchers' ontological views of the social world and how they can influence their research (Basit 2010). Bassey (1999, p.42) defines paradigms as "a network of coherent ideas about the nature of the world and the function of research which, adhered to by a group of researchers, conditions the patterns of their thinking

and underpins their research actions." Schostak (2002) likens the paradigms to road maps, where there can be times of constraint and of liberation. Whilst there may appear to be a straightforward path, the route can be far more problematic. Burton and Bartlett (2009) state that the reality of research may not fit neatly within a single research paradigm.

Basit (2010) states that whilst there are many paradigms in research, there are two prevalent paradigms with contrasting objectives. The positivist paradigm is the most established position associated with fields such as natural science. Also known as the normative paradigm, it is aligned with the ontological perspective that social reality is external to the individuals within it and therefore imposed upon them (Burrell and Morgan 1979). In linking the social and natural world, it searches for a reality out there in society. Consequently, it is highly regarded within natural science research as it has the potential to inform future policy by producing findings that can be generalisable (Cohen *et al.,* 2007; Yates, 2004). An aim of positivistic research is to provide knowledge that can be shared with others on society in its entirety (Bassey 1999). In order to do this a hypothesis is created from general theory and the researcher then attempts to validate it (Cohen *et al.,* 2011). By conducting observations within experiments, researchers can change specific variables within research to provide a measurable effect (Burton and Bartlett 2009). Inevitably, this approach to research is systematic, controlled and empirical (Cohen, *et al.*, 2011). Parsimony is used to provide findings that are as simple as possible, in the form of factual statistical information on a natural phenomenon (Cohen *et al*., 2007).

The researcher's role within the positivist paradigm is objective and is as an observer only, with the social world excluded from the researcher's influences. (Bassey 1999; Yates 2004). However, Cohen *et al.* (2007) say that this paradigm is less successful in social science research, where individuals may have complex positions that cannot necessarily be generalised. Therefore, while a positivist perspective is suitable for research designed to measure the natural world, interpretivism reflects on researching participants' individual positions and attitudes.

The interpretivist paradigm emerged following dissatisfaction in focusing on objective knowledge and the theoretical limitations imposed on researchers wishing to delve deeper into the actions of the individual (Alvesson and Skoldberg 1999). With an emphasis on researching individuals' actions, interpretivist researchers were able to investigate unexplored

areas (Sandberg 2005). According to Cohen *et al.* (2011) interpretivist researchers tend to be anti-positivist in their approaches. The absence of subjectivity within positivist research means that no factual truth can be elicited from the participants and therefore Cohen *et al.* (2007) say that a positivist perspective can be dehumanising. A background in sociological tradition and a belief that individuals instigate their own actions within the social world have encouraged me to appreciate the interpretivist perspective of research. Whilst I recognise the need for research conducted from the positivist paradigm, my epistemological position is aligned with the interpretivist way of carrying out research. This is because I believe individuals have autonomy to act differently according to their personal positions, but I also recognise that they can be influenced by society and are subject to societal constraint. Burton and Bartlett (1999, p.21) say that the interpretivist paradigm proposes that

Norms and values exist but as shifting organic elements of social life. Used and changed by people as they interpret and respond to events. External pressures are upon individuals but they do not act as some sort of external system controlling people.

The interpretivist paradigm endeavours to engage with the positions of the individuals being researched (Basit 2010). Habermas (1984) states that this form of research can be seen as a 'double hermeneutic' interpretation, as interpretive researchers interpret the positions of individuals who have already interpreted their social world. For Habermas (1984) this research paradigm comes from a naturalistic perspective and seeks to gain an in-depth understanding of a collection of participants (Basit 2010). Cohen *et al.* (2007, p.22) say "the hope of a universal theory which characterizes normative outlook gives way to multifaceted images of human behaviour as varied as the situations and contexts supporting them". In doing so, interpretivist researchers are not aiming to generalise their findings to society as a whole. On the contrary, this research paradigm is not attempting to find patterns of similarities amongst the masses; instead it looks for both similarities and differences within the collection of participants (Burton and Bartlett 2009).

In searching for meaning, interpretivist researchers look beyond an individual's actions and engage with their participants' positions in the social world (Burton and Bartlett 2009). This approach is subjective and engages with a more personable, humanly created form of research (Cohen *et al.*, 2007; Cohen *et al.*, 2011). However, with the rejection of the objective stance that is prevalent within positivist research, the interpretivist paradigm has

been subject to critique. With its focus upon the individual, questions have emerged on how interpretive researchers can justify their findings (Sandberg 2005). In their defence, interpretive researchers say that their theory shouldn't precede their research (Bassey 1999). Instead, with a focus on beginning from the individual, reality is viewed as a moment in time, in one specific place. Findings can then be compared and contrasted between different periods of time or between different places (Cohen *et al.,* 2011).

Beck (1979, p.19) says that "social scientists understand, explain and demystify social reality through the eyes of different participants, the participants themselves define the social reality". In doing so, interpretivist researchers are not external to their research but are directly involved in the research (Cohen *et al.,* 2011). Interpretivist researchers use a reflexive approach to consider their influences (Burton and Bartlett 2009). As they actively engage with their participants, their questions may influence their social interaction and therefore have the potential to influence their findings (Bassey 1999). Consequently, each interpretivist researcher could hold different views upon reality and with different participants could produce different findings on the same subject that are yet considered of equal value (Bassey 1999).

However, different forms of research paradigm do not start and end with the positivist and interpretivist perspectives. There are many other paradigms that include critical theory critiquing both the interpretivist and positivist paradigms for not addressing ideological and political contexts (Basit 2010). The critical theory paradigm emphasises the constraints put upon individuals by society and how these may influence their actions. Therefore, there is a focus in this form of research on groups that are marginalised and disempowered by society. Critical theorists endeavour to use emancipatory research in which they highlight the constraints placed upon marginalised groups and their findings identify changes that should be made to benefit society as a whole. Research conducted from the critical theorists' perspective includes work based on feminism and critical race theory. However, Basit (2010) suggests that the basic components of critical theory can be seen within some forms of interpretivist research. This is the case within my research as, from this perspective, I believe that society, and indeed the government, may provide hegemonic control that constrains and enforces conformity amongst teachers' actions. In effect, teachers might be performing to the objectives of government agendas as part of their role as educators. Therefore, they may in

practice act to achieve these objectives in ways that they would not necessarily use at a personal, rather than a professional, level.

Additionally, from a marginalized perspective and in literature based on the standards agenda, teachers appear to become disempowered, primarily because of the standards agenda (Yarker 2006). Whilst considering my epistemological stance I struggled with whether to include an element of the critical theory paradigm in my research. From research already conducted in this area the standards agenda appears to present a strict set of guidelines that require teachers to conform (Bowers 2004). However, I didn't want to assume that teachers believe they are controlled by this agenda and that they need research suggesting change. Instead, I wanted the research to focus on my participants' positions on both the standards and the inclusion agendas. Therefore, as described by Basit (2010), my position as a researcher is firmly within the interpretivist paradigm informed by critical theory.

My search for an appropriate research method

From an interpretivist perspective one's knowledge is developed through lived experiences and therefore influenced by one's "historical, cultural, ideological, gender-based and linguistic understandings of reality" (Sandberg 2005, p.45). Initially I considered using an ethnographic approach to this study. This form of research uses a small collection of participants and works closely with them to gain in-depth data (Conquergood 1991; Burton and Bartlett 2009). Researchers who use this method spend a considerable time engaging with their participants to fully ascertain their individual accounts and wider cultural influences (Conquergood 1991; Burton and Bartlett 2009). As such this method is an investigative process, involving different forms of data collection depending on the nature of the research and possibly including participant observations, photographs, videos and informal interviews (Burton and Bartlett 2009; LeComple and Preissle 1993). Ethnographic researchers develop a deep level of data that is easily recognisable to themselves and their participants (Burton and Bartlett 2009).

My interest lay specifically with situational ethnography, which Cohen *et al.* (2007) state is specific to researchers seeking to understand individuals' social contexts and the way they

choose to negotiate them. This form of ethnography appealed to me, as I actively wanted to engage with the social situation that my participants negotiated as teachers. Furthermore, I was encouraged by the potential quality of data produced by ethnography (Burton and Bartlett 2009). However I was concerned that I would be unable to gain access to schools over such a long period. Denscombe (2003) describes the difficulties that may occur when researchers attempt to access schools for research. These include gaining access to teachers in the context of the demands on their time and the cost to the school of using substitute teachers. Secondly, in the context of my own research I wondered whether this approach would enable me to engage actively with my participants' positions on both agendas. Cohen *et al.* (2011) state that observations are a 'snapshot' in time and do not necessarily capture the true extent of reality and I was also concerned that my role in the classroom would be likened to that of an OFSTED inspector, there to 'test' how much teachers know, rather than that of an interpretivist researcher engaging with their views and values (Burton and Bartlett 2009).

Therefore, I started to look for a research method that would provide me with a similar form of in-depth data to ethnographic research, without the need for hard to maintain, extended contact. Sandelowski (1991, p.161) views narrative methods as a "reconceptualisation of human beings as narrators and of their products as texts to be interpreted". Narrative research seeks to understand individual experience from within the individual (Greenhalgh *et al.*, 2005).

The use of narrative research renders one's lived experience as meaningful data (Polkinghorne1988). This is achieved by inviting participants to give their personal accounts of memorable events in personal stories (Borland 1991; Greenhalgh *et al.*, 2005). Within narrative research a dynamic interaction occurs between the participant's thinking and their narrative events (Sandelowski 2007). The researcher allows the participant to tell their stories subjectively, without interruption, as they are of the utmost importance (Sandelowski 2007). However, the researcher enquires about events that are significant in the context of the research (Moen 2006). Furthermore, Moen considers narrative research to be embedded in social context, whilst also capturing individual positions. Narrative researchers undertake a second-level narrative in their analysis, where they reflect on both their own experience of their data and on its significance to their readers. This appealed to me and this concept became an element that I tried to capture in my ultimate research design (Borland 1991).

Narrative research effectively offered me the depth of data I desired for my research (Sandelowski 2007). Additionally, I was attracted by its ability to offer insights into both individual positions and social context (Moen 2006). The use of subjectivity, allowing the participants freedom to express their positions, enabled me to develop my thoughts on how I wished to be positioned as a researcher. I saw the benefits for my research of such subjectivity in the possibility of achieving greater depth, by allowing participants more control (Moen 2006). However, the use of 'stories' was problematic as I felt that it could be difficult for my participants to pinpoint memorable events that fully divulged their positions on either agenda as these had not emerged from existing studies on this subject.

Subsequently, I began researching for a method that would provide me with a greater focus on individuals' positions, whilst retaining in-depth data that was specifically relevant to my research. George Kelly's 'personal construct theory' has a research method involving a repertory grid analysis that can be used to categorise individuals' experiences and to understand their environments (Boose 1984). Kelly talks about researchers as 'scientists' and appears to come from the positivist perspective, with an emphasis on forming theories and testing hypotheses and includes the use of quantitative data (Boose 1984). However, he rejected the concept of an objective reality and believed that his data wasn't generalisable and was only relevant to his participants (Cohen *et al.*,2007). Specifically, Kelly wanted to discover the different ways in which individuals perceived their environment and how they behaved towards it (Cohen *et al.,* 2007). As Kelly believed that individuals differed in how they constructed everyday events, he developed personal construct dimensions (Cohen *et al.,* 2007). Nevertheless, he believed that these different constructs were limited between persons. He developed 'stimuli' for a given event that could be readily compared in order to ascertain individual's constructs (Cohen *et al.,* 2007). In his work on role models, he developed a repertory grid technique in which he asked his participants to compare role models' character traits. He used a 'triarchric elicitation' method, in which participants would state how two of the 'stimuli' differed from the third (Kelly 1963; Nash 1976). He then used aspects of this data on a ratings grid and applied a non-parametric factor analysis process to analyse it (Kelly 1963).

There is a great deal of flexibility in how a researcher can use Kelly's repertory grid and it has been used in numerous ways (Cohen *et al.,* 2007). For example Kremer-Hayon (1991) used Kelly's construct theory in education to elicit their constructs of teachers during in-

service training from a selection of head teachers. There is also a clear element of subjectivity within Kelly's construct theory, as it is left to individuals to determine their views on the stimulus material (Cohen *et al.*, 2007). Kelly's construct theory focuses on individuals' positions and how they differ from one another when constructing their own positions (Cohen *et al.*, 2007). However, he paid very little attention to the social context of his participants; his interest lay with the constructs of individuals (Ryle 1975). Whilst it was encouraging to me to see the potential for complexity in ascertaining individuals' positions on a given subject, the depth of data involving the social element was missing for me in this method. Referring to my interpretive position Sandberg (2005, p.43) states that the "human world is never a world in itself but always an experienced world". Therefore, I needed to gain a research method that equally included individuals and their social contexts. Additionally, I became very interested in developments of Kelly's construct theory in using subjectivity differently to narrative research and in rank ordering the 'stimulus' materials (Cohen *et al.*, 2007). The prospect of using a mixed method in which I could gain quantitative data from factor analysis, while predominantly retaining my qualitative stance intrigued me (Kelly 1963).

Finally, I considered the use of Q-methodology. Q-methodology used the interpretive paradigm at a time when positivism was regarded as the supreme form of research (Goldman 1999). Q-methodology provides an in-depth study that investigates the complexity of different participants' positions on a given subject, where differences of opinion are to be expected (Combes *et al.*, 2004). This form of data collection provides the depth of research I aspired to, whilst also enabling analysis of shared meaning by considering the social context in which participants find themselves (Kitzinger 1999). Those who use the Q-method usually work in small-scale research, with a small number of participants. In fact, the Q-method provides such depth from limited data that it can be conducted on even a single participant to provide enough data for a research project. Furthermore, this research method doesn't aspire to generalise its findings. Unless the findings present striking similarities, the data is seen as localised to the participants of the study (Eden, Donaldson and Walker, 2005; Kitzinger 1999).

To do this a 'concourse' of statements is produced, either through literature or in a focus group that develops statements that can be directly associated with individual and societal positions. Participants are asked to rank these statements in order on a quasi-normal

distribution grid in the shape of an inverted pyramid, known as their Q-sort (Brown 1980; McKeown and Thomas 1988). By using a rank order system, this form of research has a qualiquantological approach which expands on that used in Kelly's construct theory, providing depth in the data producing quantitative factors alongside qualitative analysis of participants' Q-sorts (Stenner, Dancey and Watts 2000). In doing so, the 'theory of the self' can be evaluated in a measurable form, without dismissing the need for in-depth qualitative data associated with social influences (Eden *et al.,* 2005). The Q-method enabled me to produce the depth of data I required for my research, whilst also providing me with an interesting use of subjectivity and the facility to use factor analysis with qualitative data.

Stephenson, Q and the 'science of subjectivity'

William Stephenson (1902-1989) invented Q-methodology in the 1930s in an attempt to change the way psychologists viewed the participants in research (Weber, Danielson and Tyer 2009). Originating in the United Kingdom, Stephenson worked for prestigious scientists Charles Spearman and Sir Cyril Burt (McKeown 1990). He was the last assistant to Charles Spearman, who invented factor analysis. Spearman regarded Stephenson as a skilled statistician and referred to him as the most creative statistician in psychology (Brown 1997).

However, Stephenson was concerned about the "unremitting dominance of hypothetico-deductive methods within psychology" that focused upon positivist views of testing a hypothesis on a selection of participants (Watts and Stenner 2005, p.72). Stephenson believed that there was a need to allow for subjectivity within research whereby participants could conduct the measurements, instead of being subjected to measurement (Brown 1994-1995). Subjectivity was the key point in Stephenson's invention of what was to become Q-methodology (Brown 1994-1995). Stephenson's use of the name Q-methodology for his invention led some to assume that he referred to the fact that Q comes before R in the alphabet. R-methodology was one of the key dominant forms of positivist research and so Q seemed to embody the idea that one should ascertain individuals' positions before generalising results to a population. However, Q is also seen to represent what Stephenson called QuanSal units (QUANtification of SALiency). Brown (2008b) describes how Stephenson used quantum physics in his search for subjectivity in research. Stephenson saw a similarity between the measurements of QuanSal units and Q-methodology. In sorting statements on a quasi-normal distribution grid, Q participants place those on which they have

no strong position in the middle of the grid, to indicate that they have low saliency. Those on the extreme points of the grid are statements with a high saliency to that participant (Brown 2008b).

Another change in psychology research for which Stephenson was a proponent was a consequence of focusing upon subjectivity. He wanted to see research conducted on a smaller scale: Brown (2005, p1) says "whereas previously a large number of people were given a small number of tests, now we give a small number of people a large number of tests". However, Stephenson advocated the use of factorisation in "the usual way", with the defining difference that, instead of conducting factor analysis on 'variables', Q-methodology conducted it on individuals' positions (Brown 1994-1995). Consequently, as Brown (1994-1995, p.1) states**,** "the resulting factor composites, like the individual measures which composed them, are also drenched in subjectivity". The factors produced by the use of Q indicate correlations of position amongst the participants; without a correlation no factor would be produced (Brown 2005). Stephenson's first piece of research using Q was based on a set of colours and the determination of his participants' views on their 'pleasingness'; in this, Stephenson clearly presented Q as a form of research based upon subjectivity and on engaging with one's participant (Brown 1994-1995).

Stephenson originally detailed his ideas of what would become Q-methodology in a letter to *Nature* in 1935 (Brown 1994-1995). Subsequently, he provided more detail in "Correlating Persons Instead of Tests" (1935) and "Foundations of psychometry: Four Factors systems" (1936) (Brown 1991/1992, p.1). As McKeown (1990) states, Stephenson had invented a new concept, not just a different way to provide similar statistics, requiring scientists in psychology to think from a different perspective and embrace change (Brown 1997). In effect this illustrated an interpretive twist on a research base that was focused on positivism (Goldman 1999). This is why Q is not just a research method, but is seen as a methodology in its own right and as a way of thinking that helps a researcher to use Q effectively (Brown 1997).

Stephenson's work was seen as controversial, and many disregarded it in favour of the predominant positivist methods. In fact published differences of opinion between Stephenson and one of his mentors, Burt, date back to the very beginning of Stephenson's discovery (Brown 1991/1992). Most notable was a publication produced by both Stephenson and Burt

named “Alternative views on correlations between persons” which showed their contrasting views (Brown 1991/1992, p.1). Many critiqued Stephenson’s work and whilst scientists such as Cronbach and Gleser (1954, p.1) saw the technical innovation of using card sorting, they also considered Stephenson to have “misplaced contentiousness”, “showiness” and “excessive claims” but they also went on to say, “Q undoubtedly stands with Guttman scaling as one of the two most important recent contributions to technique”.

Burt (1955, p.1) claimed that there was no difference between the factor matrices of either the R or Q-method as “we confine ourselves to measurements obtained on a single occasion, we may either average the persons and correlate the traits, or average the traits and correlate the persons”. To Burt there was only one form of factor matrix and different ways to average it (Brown 1997). However, Stephenson believed there were two different factor matrices, one containing objective measurements and one able to present subjective data. He believed factorisation could be ‘inverted’ away from variables of individuals’ characters to engage with those individuals’ positions on a given subject (Brown 1994-1995). Consequently, the ‘variables’ became the voices of those taking part in the research (Stephenson 1935). However, noted scientists such as Cattell, Eysenck and Thurstone backed Burt’s views and Stephenson wasn’t able to make the impact he desired in British psychology. Burt’s version of correlating persons using R-methodology retained its dominance. After failing to attain a chair at Oxford, Stephenson moved to the United States and out of the field of psychology (Brown 1991/1992; Brown 1997; Watts and Stenner 2005).

There are distinctive differences between the innovative Q and the traditional R-methodologies that Burt appeared to overlook or was unable to see from his positivist stance on the use of objectivity in his research. In fact the differences between Q and R-methodology can, as Stephenson (1976) describes, be seen as representative of the subjective mode and the objective mode. Stephenson said (1976, p.1)

The objective mode is in terms of “statements” of fact and predictability, that is, instructions informing us what has to be done, or already has been done, to bring about change “outside”… The practical arts, and all sciences up to now, are based on making change “outside” as the only way to be sure of reality. The subjective form of communicability is our primary concern and involves no such change. It is within ourselves, involving our thoughts, wishes, emotions, opinions, fantasies, dreams, beliefs – in a word our “mind”. We

can conjure nothing of this into "outside" reality – no one has materialized any of it into objects in the world outside.

Indeed, there is a clear difference between Q and R-methodologies, from the methods used, through to their use of factor analysis. While Q-methodology uses statements in a Q-sort, R-methodology uses surveys (Webler, Danielson and Tuler 2009). Q- methodology focuses on individual experiences and so the participant sample is small and the population is their collection of Q statements; R-methodology gathers large bodies of data to cover all possible respondents (Brown 1994-1995; Webler, Danielson and Tuler 2009). Owing to their different research methods, Q-methodology seeks to find patterns between each participant's Q-sorts, grouping participants according to their shared positions, while R-methodology finds patterns in how each participant answers the questions, focusing on factors rather than participants (Webler, Danielson and Tuler 2009). Consequently, the differences between subjectivity and objectivity are not only prevalent in the participants' roles during the data collection, but also in how the factor analysis process is implemented.

From the 1930s Stephenson and Burt fought an academic battle based on their views of the correlation of people in psychological research. Burt effectively won this battle with two generations of psychology researchers following the traditional positivist way of producing objective research. However, some Q academics contend that research, as a whole, wasn't ready for Stephenson's invention; that his innovative work was before its time (Brown 1997). Brown (1994-1995, p.1) says "[There is] no other method or theory [that] matches Q's versatility or reach, and which comports so well with the principles and concepts of contemporary science".

The impact Q has had as a methodology on my research

Q-methodology is a way of thinking and it was apparent to me from reading numerous pieces of Q-research that there are various ways of conducting Q (Brown 1997). Therefore, I consulted the Q community via their listserv and I was advised to research four noted Q academics who have used Q in different ways and are recognised not only for their expertise but also for their different ways of using the same methodology. These Q researchers are William Stephenson, Jack Block, Steven Brown and Wendy Stainton-Rogers. The Q

community advised me to research their work and see which of them has influenced my own research. They said this would guide me towards how I might best use Q (Q Listserv 2010).

Having researched Stephenson as the inventor of Q, I understood him to be making great attempts to change an entrenched positivist position in psychological research (Brown 1997). Whilst he advocated subjectivity in his research and in turn made a move towards interpretivism, his background as a physicist and psychologist was apparent in his interpretation of Q. For instance, Stephenson stated that Q-methodology brings factor analysis from group and fieldwork into the laboratory (Stephenson 1935). Stephenson's work focused on 'scientists,' not only because of his background but also because it was psychology research that he was attempting to change. Consequently, Stephenson's work appears to bridge the gap between positivist and post-positivist research rather than committing fully to what is currently regarded as interpretivism (Brown 1997).

Jack Block (1924-2010) was also a psychologist who made a major contribution to research in the field of personality development. From the 1950s he used the Q-methodology in many pieces of his research to produce a way of conducting personality assessment (Q Listserv 2010). Whilst he was influenced by Stephenson's work, he used Q as a form of objective research. He said (Block 2003, p.198)

...I read William Stephenson on Q-methodology and was intrigued by his approach, seeing, however, some problems and possibilities different from those he had envisaged. I thought Stephenson viewed Q in almost cosmic and unverifiable terms, whereas I valued the essentials of the approach in a more plebeian way, as becoming, with some modifications and specific recognitions, a reasonable way of objectifying and making comparable otherwise noncomparable clinical descriptions... I considered that Q-methodology could provide a tenable way permitting (nay, "forcing") clinicians to express their personality formulations within a generally sufficient but standard language together with a standard "grammar".

In doing so, Block developed a type of Q-set distribution grid, named the California Q-set. Participants were asked to order variables in reference to a designated personality type (Block 1978, p.5; Brown 1997). Block viewed Q-methodology as a means of gaining "impressions and personality formations of the observer". He used a scaling technique that wasn't directly related to factor analysis to gain observer evaluation, as opposed to Stephenson's desire to

obtain self-descriptions from his participants (Block 1978). In this, Block viewed his participants in the traditional positivist sense as instruments in research. Additionally, he regarded his Q-sorts as homogenous subgroups within a large sample of data. Stephenson and Block had similar reasons for using Q as a form of assessment within their psychological research but, while Block acknowledged the benefits of asking participants to conduct Q-sorts subjectively, he tried to analyse his findings objectively, in contrast to Stephenson's through-going subjective stance (Brown 1997).

From my epistemological and ontological perspective neither Stephenson's nor Block's uses of Q would have enabled me to conduct interpretive research in the way I preferred (Block 1978; Brown 1997). It was Steven Brown's (1997) research that enabled me to view Q from an intepretivist perspective. Webler, Danielson and Tuler (2009, p.6) described Brown as "the most prominent Q-method expert alive today". From Kent State University, Brown continues to be actively involved in the Q community and in Q research (Webler, Danielson and Tuler 2009). Brown's interest in political science brings the notion of Q outside its primary focus on psychology and he notes (1999) that Stephenson's original work has been referred to in various articles and publications since his era, clarifying the specifics of Q. In fact, Brown says that at the time of Stephenson's invention researchers outside the field of psychology regarded his work in a very different light to those in the field. For instance, psychiatrist Bernard Glueck (1954, p.2) referred to Q as the "universality of uniqueness" and the "long-awaited stable and dependable frame of reference". Additionally, psychotherapist Lyman Wynne stated that Q had "widespread immediate appeal to the clinical investigator in psychiatry and related fields". Consequently, outside psychology Brown has seen Q reaching a critical mass of researchers from different fields (Brown 1997). Notably, the last three decades of the twentieth century saw the number of Q articles published rise from six hundred to over two thousand five hundred (Brown 1997). Effectively, Brown (1998, p.10) states that Stephenson wasn't the "muddled thinker" his critics perceived him to be. In fact, "he remains in advance of much contemporary theorizing about the wellspring of human action and the methodological principles required for its study".

Brown's work takes Stephenson's theory and applies it to use in modern research. Brown (1997) highlights a growing generation of researchers in psychology, health and social sciences who are embracing Q. He describes them as "beginning to take an interest in Stephenson's ideas and glimpse the vision that escaped his contemporaries" (Brown 1997,

p.10). He specifically details how Q can be used in qualitative research, owing to the subjective nature of the methodology. For this reason he sees an increase in numbers of qualitative researchers engaging with Q, because they are interested in "more than life measured by the pound" (Brown 1996, p.1). Additionally, Brown mentions different methods of choice within Q according to different epistemological positions, such as postmodernism (Grosswiler 1997), social constructionism (Stainton Rogers 1991), narrative analysis (Felkins and Goldman 1993) and feminism (Febbroro 1995; Gallivan 1994). Specifically, Brown says "Deconstruction, social construction, identity theory and discourse analysis are important contemporary approaches which Q- methodology has subserved" (1991, p.1).

Wendy Stainton-Rogers works in the field of health and is a social constructionist in post-modern research, producing Q research that includes a focus on the notion of 'addiction' (Stainton-Rogers and Stainton-Rogers 1990). Influenced by Brown's research on behaviour she was encouraged to use Q by the need to produce data on shared attitudes. Stainton-Rogers says (p.1) that "in Q [we] discovered such a means for exploring a whole plethora of images, ideas, debates and explanations". However, as a social constructionist she wasn't interested in individual Q-sets, but in the differentiation between participants' viewpoints (Stainton-Rogers and Stainton-Rogers 1990). Stainton-Rogers does not follow Stephenson's interest in subjectivity and instead sees problems with a focus on self-reference, as she believes individuals can lie and deceive researchers concerning their true positions. She believes her participants' viewpoints are 'just stories' and is instead interested in her data as a collection of participants' stories. She says her use of Q is "merely a means of exploring what cultural elements tend in practice to be voiced in conjunction with each other" (p.1). Therefore, her focus is on social influences and she has used two Q sets, one on understanding and one on social policies, to make direct comparisons of collective positions (Stainton-Rogers and Stainton-Rogers 1990). Having gained two differing Q-sets per participant, she had obtained Q factors that were directly comparable.

Whilst I was intrigued by Stainton-Roger's innovative use of Q-sorts, I wanted to engage with my participants' personal and social positions. Therefore, in a development of her research, I decided that I wanted to research both my participants' individual Q-sorts and their collective data.

Interestingly, Brown (1991, p.1) states that differences in the use of Q show the flexibility within the methodology. Brown's (1999) work on Q and qualitative research determined the importance of subjectivity to qualitative researchers. He noted an additional advantage of using Q, in that the statements are a 'lingua franca'. In contrast to traditional qualitative research methods there are no right or wrong answers to Q statements or to a focus on the participants' points of view. However, a theoretical dilemma emerges in the use of both quantitative and qualitative data collection within Q. Traditionally, quantitative approaches are linked to positivist research; each involves analysing numerical data that are derived from a view of the relationship between theory and research as consisting of both necessary truth and generalisation (Birley 1998; Bryman 2004). In contrast, qualitative approaches emerged from dissatisfaction with the dominant positivist form of research and so qualitative research is associated with interpretivism, involving findings through comparisons, contrasts and regularities in the data (Brown 1996; Cohen *et al.,* 2007; Yates 2004). These approaches are usually used as an either/or scenario in research. For many researchers they are separate entities that process research findings in very different ways, both epistemologically and ontologically (Bryman 2004).

Brown states that Anselm Strauss and Juliet Corbin (1990, p.1) promoted qualitative research as the "only kind of research that produces findings not arrived at by means of statistical procedures or other means of quantification". Brown disagrees with their argument and emphasises that one of the objectives of qualitative research is to produce systematic gathering of data. Brown believes that Q's use of subjectivity enables the statistical aspect of Q data collection to be a valuable tool in providing clarity in research. Furthermore, he thinks this clarity supersedes any form of qualitative data gathered through the unaided perceptions of the researcher.

Recently, there have been moves in research to combine both qualitative and quantitative approaches in a mixed-method approach. Advocates of this believe that, by combining the two approaches, the constraints that apply to one are compensated for in the use of the other. Consequently, the mixed-method approach magnifies the advantages of both research methods (Bryman 2004). However, Brown (1991, p.1) believes that "Q probes to deeper levels of invariance than typically conceived by either of these linguistic conventions". Brown believes that qualitative researchers can use Q without having either to set aside their principal approach or to engage in a simplistic welding together of quantitative and

qualitative methods. Brown says, “In Q the role of mathematics is quite subdued and serves primarily to prepare the data to reveal their structure”. Therefore, with influences from Brown’s research, my Q research remains qualitative, with a supplementary use of statistical analysis.

My Q-method and authors who influenced my design process

Developing my concourse

The initial stage of the Q-method is to develop a selection of statements, named a concourse. The concourse is then synthesised into a Q-set of statements to be sorted by each participant onto a quasi-normal distribution grid (Eden, Donaldson and Walker 2005). I began with the important task of deciding where the boundaries lay within my concourse (Eden, Donaldson and Walker 2005). Eden and colleagues (2005, p.416) propose that “statements can be opinions, plans, questions, options or strategies”. Noting that the statements are usually, but not necessarily, verbal statements, they describe how the concourse “Doesn’t exist out there to be found, but is constructed in research process” (Eden *et al*., 2005, p.416). Statements can be both personal to the participants and social, involving potential societal or cultural influences on individuals’ positions (Goldman 1999). Therefore, I decided to develop a concourse of verbal statements that represented the potential personal and social aspects of my participants’ positions. I achieved the personal element by having some statements that started with ‘I’ or ‘my’, for instance, ‘my position on this initiative is influenced by my experience’. Additionally, I also had statements which directly represented the government’s agenda objectives, for instance ‘Statutory Assessment Tests are worthwhile for every child’ (See Appendix two for list of Q-statements).

There are different ways of obtaining a concourse. Barry and Proops (1999) detail how qualitative interviews can be conducted in order to ascertain different positions directly from participants. However, they also say that ‘secondary’ materials, such as publications and literature, can develop a concourse (Dryzek and Berejikian 1993) and I decided that my concourse should be developed in this way. Moreover, I obtained peer validation by showing my concourse to two lecturers in the university, whose expertise is in education and inclusion. My reason for not using pre-interviews with participants to devise my concourse was twofold. I researched the inclusion agenda for my undergraduate dissertation and found

that my participants struggled to express fully their positions on it. In fact, some of the teachers in this study really felt they knew little about the agenda. Additionally, in the literature on the standards agenda, there seemed to be many examples of teachers holding negative views. I was concerned that if my pre-interview participants all had negative attitudes to the standards agenda, that might have a detrimental impact on my concourse so that it wouldn't necessarily represent different positions on the agenda. In order to devise a concourse that represented every type of possible position I decided to focus on secondary literature and peer validation.

Eden and colleagues (2005, p.414) stated that the concourse represents "the sum of discourse on the research topic". Stenner, Dancey and Watts (2000, p.442) refer to this as the "field of sayability". However, these Q articles had contrasting positions on when a concourse is complete. Glaser and Strauss (1967) argued that a concourse is not complete until the literature is fully exhausted, whereas Watts and Stenner (2005, p.75) said that the concourse only needs to cover the information available in that specific research area. As this research was for my doctorate I decided to exhaust all possible positions represented in research articles on both the inclusion and standards agendas. Consequently, I stopped developing my concourse once I had exhausted all the literature available at that time.

Watts and Stenner (2005) believe that concourse size is to some extent determined by subject matter, whilst Eden and colleagues (2005) advise Q researchers to consider the time it will take for each participant to complete the Q-sort process. Watts and Stenner (2005) noted that, in general, 40-80 statements are sufficient in one concourse. Therefore, I developed 48 statements, trying to cover all possible positions of either agenda succinctly. My reasoning for this decision was that I wanted my participants to do the Q-sort twice, once for the inclusion agenda and once for the standards agenda. Consequently, if the Q-sort was larger, time constraints might not permit me to complete the research. Additionally, Watts and Stenner (2005), influenced by Brown's (1980) research, argued that a smaller Q-set doesn't limit participants in presenting their positions within the Q-sort process. Watts and Stenner (2005, p.78) concluded that even smaller Q-sets have "sufficient room for individuality".

Deciding upon my Q-set, participant sample size and conditions of instruction

Q-set

Participants order the statements onto a Q-set which is known as a reversed quasi-normal distribution grid and is depicted as an inverted pyramid (Brown 1980). This form of distribution grid is known as a 'forced distribution', as it effectively forces participants to compare and contrast the statements so that they will fit into a fixed pattern. Whilst some qualitative researchers disagree with this method, Watts and Stenner (2005) concluded that the use and style of the distribution make no notable difference, suggesting that this is because of the amount of choice open to participants and the data produced. As in interview questions, participants have the freedom to answer the Q-sort according to their position on the subject matter.

The structure of the distribution grid is important to my Q research, as the left side represents the statements that are least agreeable to participants' positions and the right side represents statements that are most agreeable to their positions. Consequently, the distribution grid demands that participants place fewest statements in the strongest positions within the grid (see Appendix three). Watts and Stenner (2005) argued that any number of statements can be located in each column of the distribution grid but advise that most grids should have an 11-13 point scale, from either –5 to +5, or, -6 to +6. I decided to use an 11 point scale from –5 to +5, with a column pattern of 1 2 4 6 8 6 4 2 1. In doing so, I used the smallest possible number of statements in both the –5/+5 and –4/+4 columns so that I could really ascertain the most extreme statements for each participant.

Participant sample size

Stainton-Rogers (1995) proposed that 40-60 participants are sufficient for Q research. However, Watts and Stenner (2005) also noted that a smaller number of participants can be used. In order to gain an overall picture of the mainstream primary education system, I developed a plan to go into different schools, in affluent areas, low socio-economic locations and in Catholic and Church of England primary schools. This decision wasn't intended to produce a comparative study, but was directed at gaining as wide a selection as possible of mainstream primary schools. Nevertheless, if direct comparisons emerged from my data, I

would present them in my findings. I was additionally influenced by Watts and Stenner's (2005) research, which warned against having too many participants. They noted that using too many participants can mean that detail is lost in data analysis. Therefore, I decided to use around 25 participants, recognising that the data produced would be twice that from a conventional Q data collection as I was to use the same Q-sort twice.

Conditions of instruction

Conditions of instruction enable the researcher to focus their participants on placing statements according to a specific research question. They are therefore used before participants start to place their statements and should ensure that the direction of placement is associated with the research area. Being influenced by Wendy Stainton-Rogers (Stainton-Rogers and Stainton-Rogers 1990) and her non-traditional use of Q, I decided to adapt the Q-method to fit my research topic effectively. Having two different agendas as the focus of my research, I wondered whether I could adapt the Q-method to represent separate data on both the inclusion and standards agendas, while at the same time providing the opportunity for participants to consider the other agenda's statements in relation to the conditions of instruction.

Reading McKeown and Thomas (1988) I discovered that multiple conditions of instruction could be used for one Q-set when there is a possibility that the participant will perform differently under separate conditions of instruction. From this I developed a set of Q-set statements that were not readily identifiable with either the inclusion or standards agenda. Some of the statements had the words 'inclusion' or 'standards' in them. For instance, 'I believe that children with special educational needs can be fully included in every aspect of the schooling experience'. However, all of my statements applied to both agendas, as in the example above because, to be inclusive, all children should appear within the standards agenda and, in comparison, for all children to achieve, all should feature in the inclusion agenda (Avramidis and Norwich 2002; George and Clay 2008). For this combined agenda Q-set I developed two conditions of instruction that indicated to the participants which agenda they were focusing upon during their sort. Firstly, I asked the participants, "I need you to place the statements down on the distribution grid, according to your position on the inclusion agenda". Once this was done I asked the same participants to "…place the

statements down on the distribution grid, according to your position on the standards agenda".

Throughout my study I unsuccessfully attempted to find other Q articles that had used one Q-sort with two conditions of instruction. Consequently, I attended a Q workshop developed by the Q community to check that my Q-method was plausible for factor analysis. They confirmed that this was absolutely suitable and noted that they believed it had been used in some unpublished doctoral work. I therefore asked for information on this from the Q community via the Q-Listserv (Q Listerv 2009) and was told that, while the number of relevant studies is limited, this method can be used.

Performing factor analysis of my Q-data

Factor analysis conducted for Q research assesses patterns of similarity and difference and generates theoretical constructs. Factors are produced through the inverted process of obtaining commonality from a group of participants' positions. Therefore, as advocated by Stephenson (1935), it is the statements that are measured during factor analysis, not the participants. There are dedicated computer software programs designed specifically to analyse Q data. I used the PQ method, which provides a computerised method of inputting data and producing factors (Eden *et al*., 2005). Stephenson advocated the use of centroid analysis as a way of maintaining the currency of this traditional form. Brown (1991) stated that centroid analysis extracts factors for rotation from the initial set of factor loadings. The number of factors extracted is dependent on the researcher; however PQ method automatically refers to 7. Watts and Stenner (2005) stated the advantage of using centroid analysis is being able to consider the data from a variety of perspectives, prior to factor rotation. I therefore used centroid analysis alongside the PQ method.

Factor rotation enables the researcher to view every possible commonality amongst participants' positions, both across and within factor clusters (Brown 1993). In contrast to Stephenson's preferences for theoretical rotation, by hand, Watts and Stenner (2005) advocated the use of varimax rotation by qualitative researchers. Critics of this form of rotation believe it is too mathematical for qualitative research but Watts and Stenner (2005) believe that it is more simple and reliable. Factor rotation is essentially part of factor

analysis, intended to reveal commonalities that may not feature within the initially produced factors. At times, individual Q-sets may not correlate with any factor; by rotating the factors their relationships with other positions can be brought to the forefront (Brown 1993). Interestingly, Watts and Stenner (2005, p.72) also noted that how to rotate factors and which factors are to be retained is left to the judgement of the researcher. This allows another form of subjectivity into the "the heart of seemingly the most quantitative stage of Q". Additionally, they outline two key aspects of factor rotation that are beneficial to the qualitative researcher. Firstly, the factors and how they are rotated all represent the participant's input to the 'emergent factor structures'. Secondly, the act of rotation increases the number of 'variables', whilst varimax still automatically represents the strongest factor solutions (Watts and Stenner 2005). Consequently, rotating my factors using varimax allowed me to acknowledge as many commonalities as possible among my participants.

Eden, Donaldson and Walker (2005, p.418) stated that factor interpretation is a "combination of computer processing and interpretation". Those Q-sorts that correlate highly with one particular factor then define that factor. In effect, an 'ideal' Q-set is established by the computer process to represent the commonality amongst those participants (Eden, Donaldson and Walker 2005). Many Q researchers retain factors that have an eigenvalue of 1.00 or higher. The eigenvalue represents the strength of that factor in relation to others. However, Watts and Stenner (2005) recognise another stance, in which factors are retained because at least two Q-sorts load heavily upon them. Additionally, once the factors have been selected, Watts and Stenner (2005) said that interpretation is a truly interpretivist task.

Kitzinger (1999, p.269) views the process as "a researcher telling a plausible story about the choices made by the research participant". Researchers can encapsulate the collaborative position detailed within the factor in the participants' terms. Qualitatively, Watts and Stenner (2005) advocated naming each factor, which Eden and colleagues (2005) also see as a fundamentally interpretive process. Not only can each factor be analysed qualitatively, but each individual Q-sort can also undergo qualitative analysis and so the use of qualitative methods is intensified throughout the Q analysis (Watts and Stenner 2005). (See Appendix seven for original factor analysis statistics).

Q and the use of additional qualitative research methods

As Brown (1997) states, Q can be conducted with a predominantly qualitative form of analysis for one's given factors. However, Eden, Donaldson and Walker (2005), notably in their work on semi-structured interviews, suggest that Q can also be complemented by the use of additional qualitative research methods. Mason (2002, p.62) believes that semi-structured interviews have their own character. He says that there can be "quite large variations in style and tradition". Semi-structured interviews have a schedule of questions; however the researcher is also free to devise other questions during the interview in order to develop the data further (Basit 2010). This form of interview appealed to me, as I wanted to engage fully with my participants' positions and to gain as much in-depth data as possible. By using semi-structured interviews I understood that I could devise a schedule of questions, either for each participant or collectively amongst the participants, and also have the freedom to digress from the schedule where appropriate. In doing so, I could gain further individual data, developing additional detail in the data relevant to my research topic. Additionally, the use of semi-structured interviews appeared to provide information that extended my data from Q. Whilst Q elicits qualitative and quantitative data around collaborative factors, interviews provided me with the prospect of greater detail on an individual basis. I decided to conduct semi-structured interviews on a one to one basis with my participants, as I wanted to ensure that my data engaged with their individual positions.

Interviews are used at different stages of the Q process. Usually, pre Q-sort interviews are conducted to develop the Q-concourse and, in those circumstances, the interviews questions are constructed to develop every possible position on the given subject (Papworth and Walker 2008). Additionally, pre Q-sort interviews can be used as a main source of data collection with Q used as a secondary data collection method. Eden *et al.* (2005) concluded that Q-sorts are often conducted during or immediately after an interview. Stainton Rogers and Kitzinger (1995) used interviews during the Q-sort to ask participants questions regarding where they were placing statements, whilst Eden *et al.* detailed the use of interviews, immediately after the Q-sort process, to obtain data on participants' reflections on the Q-sort. Shinebourne (2009) used post Q-sort interviews to adjust the Q-sort according to suggestions from participants who had just completed it.

However, Stephenson (1972), the inventor of Q, advised us to go back to participants and discover their interpretations of the analysis. Stainton Rogers (Stainton Rogers and Kitzinger 1999) used a similar post Q-sort interview, using brief summaries of factor interpretations. Watts and Stenner (2005) said that this *post hoc* analysis is a vital part of the Q procedure, aiding factor interpretation, as it is based around participants' positions on the factors. I decided to conduct post Q-sort semi-structured interviews with the same participants for purposes of respondent validation. Additionally, by using post Q-sort interviews in this way I could further engage with participants' positions and with what they felt about the factors that represented their positions (See Appendix Five).

Validity and reliability

Brown takes an interesting stance on validity within the Q-sort process. Focusing on the use of subjectivity within Q-sort, he claims that the issue of validity doesn't exist as the Q-sort is based on a participant's point of view. Consequently, he believes Q-sorts have "little use for such platonic concepts as validity. There is no outside criterion for a person's own point of view" (Stainton Rogers and Stainton Rogers 1990, p.1). However, Cresswell (2009) said that validity focused upon the researcher's interpretation of these findings. Cohen *et al.* (2011) believed that qualitative researchers should describe validity in terms of how far their research is able to detail participants' positions. Considering my qualitative research in its entirety, I determined that validity is improved in my research in five different ways, with the use of a pilot study, self-description, peer debriefing, respondent validation and triangulation.

Pilot studies not only check the cohesion and clarity of data collection methods, but also determines if the chosen research methods will produce meaningful and useful data (Birley 1998). Robson (2002, p.185) says "this helps to throw up some of the inevitable problems of converting your design into reality". I conducted a pilot study on my research in its entirety, so that both the Q and semi-structured interviews were piloted in the same format and structure that I planned to use in my main data collection.

Self-description is an interesting concept in qualitative research as it involves researchers analysing their own positions on the research subjects. This form of self-description is meant to reduce levels of researcher bias (Long and Johnson 2000). However, once the researcher has established a personal position on the research subject, there are different ways of using it

within qualitative research. Long and Johnson (2000) believe that once researchers have self-analysed personal positions, they are able to move past them and analyse the positions of others without allowing their own positions to have an impact on the data. However, Cresswell (2009) concludes that a researcher's position is inherent within the interpretation of data. He says that data is shaped by researchers' experiences, for example their backgrounds. As an inclusionist I recognise that, personally, I have a commitment to inclusion which contributed towards my decision to study in this area. However, in my research, I focus upon the positions of my participants.

Peer debriefing can also reduce the prospect of researcher bias by allowing peers external to the research to comment on and review it (Cresswell 2009). Cresswell believes that researchers seek external interpretations in order to improve the validity of their own research. Without peer debriefing, research can become so isolated that it only resonates with the researcher and not with an external audience. I was aware that, at various stages of my research, I would need peer debriefing. Prior to conducting my pilot study I reviewed my factor statements with two lecturers and I also reviewed my factors with several lecturers in my faculty, in order to gain different perspectives on interpreting them.

Additionally, I have presented my interpretations of the data for critique by various peers within the University during my supervisory meetings and at internal research conferences. Long and Johnson (2000) point out that conferences and workshops are an essential part of peer debriefing within doctoral studies and I have therefore periodically presented my research at various stages of its maturity to peers with different expertise in related areas. For instance, I presented my research content and qualitative data interpretation to members of the British Education Studies Association. In doing so, I was able to develop skills in describing Q to an audience that was unlikely to have heard of the methodology previously. In addition I presented my Q analysis and statistical data at the annual International Society for the Scientific Study of Subjectivity conference in 2011. At this conference I was able to present to noted Q academics, and to provide detail of my specific methodological choices. By presenting at these high profile conferences I gained extremely helpful peer review of my research and was also frequently encouraged to consider my research in its entirety.

In returning to one's participants and asking their opinion of the interpreted data, respondent validation can also aid the reduction of researcher bias (Robson 2002). Qualitative

researchers do this in various ways, from taking data back during the actual process of its collection to offering participants the entire research findings and asking for their views on accuracy (Cresswell 2009). Cresswell (2009) urges researchers to take back polished parts of their data analysis to participants in follow-up interviews. This, he recommends, enables researchers to engage in respondent validation throughout the interpretation of their data. Respondent validation occurs throughout each stage of my research, in the conduct of post Q-sort, semi-structured interviews and in providing the final study to each participating school. Additionally, by deciding to go back and re-do my semi-structured interviews, I was able to discuss my Q findings thoroughly with the teacher participants.

Triangulation can be conducted in various ways in qualitative research, depending on the choice of participants and on data collection methods. Cresswell (2009) states that if over-arching themes are evident in data spanning different participants or data collection methods, the use of different data sources can improve the validity of the research. In my research, I used triangulation by using both Q-sorts and semi-structured interviews.

On a technical level the flexible designs of qualitative interpretive research can't be standardised for replicability (Long and Johnson 2000; Robson 2002). Wellington (2000) says that if the validity of the research is sufficiently robust there will be credibility without the need for reliability. Mischler (1990, p.373) transforms the concept of reliability for use in qualitative research. He says "reformulating validation as the social discourse through which trustworthiness is established precludes such familiar shibboleths as reliability, falsifiability and objectivity". Cresswell (2009) notes that qualitative researchers need to use an audit trail to document as many of their research steps as possible. Additionally, Cresswell suggests repeat checking of transcripts to ensure that no mistakes have been made. Having undertaken both an audit trail and transcript checks I have tried to make my research as credible as possible as far as the qualitative concept of reliability is concerned.

Ethical considerations

Flick (2006, p.44) claims that, in many fields, research has become "an issue of ethics", with ethical considerations dominating every part of the research process. On moral grounds, ethical consideration involves researchers reflecting on their actions and ensuring sensitivity towards their participants. Ethical considerations have emerged from the need to protect

research participants and prevent researchers from being tempted to undertake research without considering their participants (Denscombe 2003). This growing development of ethics within every form of research has led to the establishment of different ethical committees, designed to produce ethical guidelines for their specific fields (Flick 2006). As my field is education, the British Educational Research Association (BERA) (BERA 2004) has produced ethical guidelines for my research.

However, Sikes (2006) says that ethical considerations can present problematic issues for researchers throughout the research process. Frankfort-Nachmias and Nachmias (1992) express this major issue as a cost/benefit ratio. They believe that there is a conflict between the right to conduct effective research and the rights of participants. Similarly, Cohen and colleagues (2011) conclude that there are no right or wrong answers to the balance of these two imperatives and that researchers should adhere as closely as possible to their ethical committees' guidelines.

In determining the participants for any piece of research, BERA (2011) advised that researchers should consider their vulnerability. My research focuses upon teachers, who are unlikely to be classed as vulnerable in the context of ethical considerations. Whilst I was very conscious that participants could have a special educational need, their role as educators meant that they would be capable of providing fully informed consent to my research (BERA 2011). However, whilst they were able to give informed consent, the role of gatekeepers was also a prominent feature in my research. Gatekeepers, as Cresswell (2009) states, are parties with the authority to provide the necessary access to the desired participants. In attempting to access schools, I had to adhere to each school's policy of having a written letter sent to an appointed person, detailing my research. In the case of most of my schools I could only access the participants who were offered to me, usually through a managerial member of school staff. Most of the schools told me that they had asked teachers, usually during a staff meeting, who would like to take part in my research but I was aware that my participant sample might be teachers whom the school had chosen to participate. While I couldn't prevent the use of gatekeepers in schools where I was, in effect, cold calling, I was able to work with some schools through contacts with a specific teacher, which I hoped would reduce the potentially negative effects of gatekeeping on my findings.

BERA's (2011) ethical guidelines indicate that researchers need to disclose all relevant information regarding the research, prior to its being conducted. It is important to disclose the nature and purpose of research with prospective participants, giving them the right to participate voluntarily, in full knowledge of the relevant information (Denscombe 2002). Howe and Moses (1999, p.77) emphasise the importance of informed consent as the "cornerstone of ethical behaviour", placing the right of free choice at the forefront of participation. I ensured that participants signed a written consent form that detailed all relevant research information, prior to their participation in the research (See Appendix one).

In order to adhere to the ethical obligation of confidentiality I ensured that, in recording data from participants, I didn't disclose any information that might readily identify them. I also safely stored all the data that I collected and this will be deleted when the project is complete. I also considered identifiability and the necessity of providing no information that links unique individual attributes with the data produced. In writing up my findings I considered how I identified my participants in terms of their roles and the location of their primary schools. I refer frequently to teachers collectively and having schools in different locations has meant that no one school can easily be identified so that no one teacher can be identified. When discussing the findings of an individual teacher I only referred to their school being in either a low or an affluent socio-economic location. Additionally, in order to ensure anonymity, I used pseudonyms names for each individual teacher.

Main data collection considerations

Pilot study reflections

I conducted my pilot study with three teachers from one primary school in an affluent socio-economic location. These participants taught different year groups, years 2, 3 and 6. They had different experiences of teaching but all had fewer than ten years experience. I completed both the Q-methodology and semi-structured interview pilot studies with the same teachers, visiting them together to collect Q data and then returning seven days later with the analysed data. The teachers conducted their Q-sorts, for both agendas' conditions of instruction, in the same room, on the same day. However, their semi-structured interviews

were carried out in a separate room, on an individual basis, a week later. Following my Q analysis I devised interview schedules that were specifically relevant to each individual participant. Furthermore, after asking a specific question I discussed my Q analysis for further comment and respondent validation. From these results I was able to ascertain that my Q-sort worked effectively in gaining interesting data on both agendas. Additionally, there appeared to be sufficient detail within the Q-sorts, showing a range of differences between each factor.

From the inclusion agenda Q data I was able to extract two factors in the factor analysis process. The first factor, named 'I would if I could, but it's practically impossible', was formed by participants two and three. With an eigenvalue of 1.6419 and 54% of the overall correlated factors, this factor had a very strong resolution. By qualitatively analysing this factor I was able to ascertain that these two participants held pragmatic positions on inclusion. Believing in the ideological aspirations of inclusion, they nevertheless encountered barriers to its full implementation. These variables included an inadequate school environment, lack of available training and the need for more government guidelines (24:+4; 32:-5; 41:-4 gives the statement numbers and then the distribution positions). Participant one formed the second factor, named 'It's all about the placement, not what happens on a day to day basis'. This factor had an eigenvalue of 0.7460, with 24% on the overall correlated factors. Interestingly, this factor's strength is much smaller than factor one's and in theory too small to be seen as significant as that would usually demand an eigenvalue of over 1.0. However, I reflected upon Watts and Stenner's (2005) research which stated that Q-methodology can be used with one single participant. Therefore, whilst the eigenvalue wasn't high, this analysis represented a difference of position for this participant. This factor represented an integrationalist view of inclusion which focused upon placement of children with SEN into mainstream settings. It also highlighted different practical barriers, including lack of support from the school, the need for more time allocated to inclusion and lack of funding to implement the agenda fully (29:+4; 31:+4; 30:-4).

The standards agenda factor analysis only produced one factor that all three teachers collectively developed, named 'The government may think standards are everything, but I certainly don't'. This factor had an eigenvalue of 1.9542, with 65% of the overall correlated factors. This position represented a sceptical view of the standards agenda and the objectives the teachers felt they had to implement. Qualitatively, each participant believed strongly that

government viewed a ‘good teacher’ as one who could point to achievement for which evidence comes from national league tables. Additionally, each Q sort appeared to separate the education of children with SEN within the standards agenda. This was evident through each teacher’s highlighting the importance of their added-on systems, such as the statementing process and the p-scale system. Specifically identifying children with moderate SEN, they each felt that these children found it easier to be educated within this agenda.

After further investigation within the post semi-structured interviews I discovered that different aspects of their positions ranged from the integration era, through to the inclusion objectives. Consequently, each participant’s position resonated with their factor but they had positions that were far more complex. For instance, participant one stated that she did believe somewhat in the school adapting to meet the needs of children with special educational needs. However, the dominating aspect of her position, evident in her Q-sort, revolved around an integrationalist perspective and this was evident within the factor process. In a sense the factor analysis offered to me in my pilot study provided the opportunity to have initial detailed data, which I was then able to extend during my semi-structured interviews.

Whilst each teacher loaded on the same factor for the standards agenda, the post Q-sort semi-structured interviews provided subtle differences within their perspectives. Participant one disagreed with key stage one SATs and advocated their removal while participant two felt that the assessment of teachers through league tables should be curbed. Interestingly, participant three felt she had to ‘prep’ her children for SATs. Whilst she agreed with assessment, she held comparatively the same position as participant two, that the league tables should be removed. Within the semi-structured interviews I was able to ascertain that each teacher agreed with the need for assessment and accountability. However, they all disagreed with aspects of the standards agenda, mainly around the use of SATs and the league tables.

Furthermore, the post Q-sort semi-structured interviews brought the agendas together, with data describing the practical implementations of these two agendas in tandem. Overwhelmingly each participant indicated that the standards agenda prevailed in the schooling system. Consequently, for these participants the inclusion agenda was practically implemented as much as possible in a system that is geared towards standards.

Reflecting upon my pilot study I believed that it had been successful in establishing detailed data from the Q-method that was then extended during the semi-structured interviews. Additionally, I found that my Q-sort provided sufficient diversity within its statements to offer detailed data for analysis on both agendas. However, following dialogue during the participants' sorting of the Q-statements, I changed the wording on two statements so that they were easier for participants to understand. I was surprised at the similarities within the participants' positions on the standards agenda. However, with a small number of participants there were likely to be fewer factors and I was also aware of the similarities in their experiences of teaching. This alerted me to the need to ensure I obtained participants who had different levels of experience, and who taught different year groups and to consider the aspect of experience within my data interpretation. Furthermore, I discovered during the pilot Q-sort that participants took, on average, around 30-40 minutes per condition of instruction. I concluded from this that I might need to visit some teachers on a different day, in order for them to allocate enough time to complete both conditions of instruction. Finally, the teachers asked to complete the Q-sort process in the same room. During that process, I had to request that they didn't comment on statements in a way that would influence each other's positions. I became aware of the need to address this with any schools that would only allow me access to complete the Q-sort in groups.

Following the pilot study I decided that I needed to learn more about analysing Q-data and the different data that I could gain from using the PQ method. In response I registered for a Q workshop where I was able to network. The presenter, Simon Watts, subsequently came to the University and ran another Q-workshop, which I also attended and helped to co-ordinate.

The sociological-psychological development that emerged in my research

Discovered primarily in the factor analysis and further discussed within the post Q-sort semi-structured interview, a socio-psychological element appeared in the positions of each teacher. All three teachers appeared to hold different positions on the inclusion and standards agendas that superseded the single position highlighted in previous related research. Each of these teachers held a personal position of belief in the ideological concept of inclusion and of their accountability for inclusion through the standards agenda. However, professionally, they each detailed practical barriers to both agendas' implementation, including lack of support

from government, which was in contrast to the limited research conducted in this area (Avramidis and Norwich 2002).

The combination of the Q and semi-structured interviews represented teachers' positions with rich complexity. From this analysis I began to read about psychological strategies these teachers may have encountered and this led me to theories such as cognitive dissonance (Heine and Lehman 1997). This literature developed a socio-psychological component in my research, considering the complexity of individual positions alongside the impact of social influences. The introduction of this literature become an important part of my literature review and seemed to flow naturally from my initial data analysis.

The use of factor statements within my main data collection

Within the pilot study I verbally informed my participants about the results obtained from their Q data. Whilst reflecting upon my pilot study I decided that the teachers had initially been apprehensive, making humorous comments such as 'did I pass?'. It appeared as if they believed I had conducted some form of test, even though I had thoroughly detailed the research process and its objectives. In fact, they seemed to believe that I possessed information they themselves didn't know about their positions. Additionally, once I had divulged the Q findings, it appeared that each teacher agreed with the results without fully considering their positions. Stephenson's intentions (described in Brown 1991/2) were that Q was not to be seen as a test and so I considered how I could change the way in which I collected data in order to avoid such misunderstanding.

Stainton-Rogers and Stainton-Rogers (1990) presented factor interpretations to their participants in order to ascertain their positions on the factors. However, their research rejected my concept of subjectivity and so I felt that I should adapt this method in line with my interpretative position as a researcher. I concluded that Stainton-Rogers and Stainton-Rogers' (1990) use of visual statements would be beneficial but, in order to eliminate the notion of any form of test, I developed for my main data collection separate statements derived from each factor that I presented to the participants. I then asked participants to look through the statements, initially in relation to the inclusion agenda and then for the standards

agenda. I wanted to gain two forms of interpretation from them, firstly where, in terms of factors, they felt the Q analysis placed them and secondly, whether they felt their position fell between two or more factor statements. I wanted to increase further the subjectivity in my research, empowering participants to decide what they thought of the Q data, rather than what they thought of me as the researcher. Once I had presented them with either the inclusion or standards factors and each participant had provided me with their answers, my interviews were structured around their responses. I then extended my questions accordingly to ascertain fully their positions, whilst also including some pre-prepared questions based on the information missing from their Q-sort and initial analysis. With the use of factor statements I felt that any discrepancy between the Q analysis and the participants' interpretations would provide deep insights into the complexities that might appear within my participants' positions.

Main data collection information

For my initial data, I was conducting Q-sorts in six primary schools, two from affluent socio-economic locations, two from disadvantaged areas, one Catholic and one Church of England school. The main construct to be explored was whether the inclusion and standards agendas can be practically implemented in tandem. That is why I chose to use a selection of schools that were in diverse situations in terms of socio-economic location and type of school. My rationale for using these schools was to gain a range of perspectives rather than perform a comparative study between schools. Having selected the schools I accessed teachers for my research through gatekeepers such as the head teacher, deputy head or another member of teaching staff. These individuals discussed my research at staff meetings and asked who would be willing to participate. Details of volunteer teachers were forwarded to me and I was able to arrange appropriate times to gain my data collection.

I had a final total of 26 participants, varying in year groups taught and in their experience of teaching, who successfully completed the Q-sort process in this first phase of data collection,. The Q-sorts were conducted at different times during the day according to schools' requirements; some were completed during the school day, some at lunchtimes and some after school ended. Three teachers were removed from the Q analysis as they placed the same statements on more than one place on the distribution grid. Furthermore, one participant successfully completed the inclusion Q-sort but not the standards Q-sort and

therefore has been represented within the inclusion Q-sort analysis only. Careful attention was paid to ensuring that the correct participants were identified between the two sets of data analysis by consistently using the same number for each participant in both sets of data. I took blank distribution grid sheets to the Q-sort process to mark down Q-sort distributions. I had a separate report sheet, asking each participant to write a sentence and explain the placement of their chosen statements in the most extreme distribution columns (+./-5 and +/-4, see Appendices three and four).

For the second phase of data collection I was able to obtain access to 16 of the original Q-sort participants. Fourteen were among the 26 who completed the Q-sort successfully and two were individuals whose Q-sorts had to be discarded. This second phase of data collection was completed after the initial factor analysis had been completed. Once the Q data had been fully analysed, both qualitatively and statistically, it appeared that the semi-structured interview data didn't actually supply extended data to the original Q-data. Therefore, I went back to eight of the original Q-sort teachers to re-conduct the post Q-sort semi-structured interviews. I initially started these interviews using the factor statements again, as the participants were then teaching another academic year and I was interested in analysing whether they felt their positions had changed. I went on to ask a selection of scheduled questions, along with any individual questions derived from the Q-sort process. In doing so, I was able to gain additional extended data that has provided me with a further degree of depth to my research (see Appendix six for examples of the transcripts).

Finally, my third and final phase of data analysis was conducting the factor analysis on my previously obtained Q data for both agendas simultaneously and recording this as separate data. This process further supported my findings but also extended them by considering teachers' positions on these agendas collaboratively. Whilst I ended my data gathering with various phases of data collection and analysis, there still remains no attempt to generalise these findings. I consider this research to provide in-depth data, validated and extended across all phases of data collection, exploring the positions of the participants represented in my research. From my interpretive perspective I have attempted to be as reflective as possible within every stage of the research, consciously positioning myself in such a way that I could double-check my decisions both theoretically and practically.

Limitations to research

The limitations within this research exist in using a methodology for the first time and learning from these experiences throughout the process. Gaining the Q-data proved difficult as teachers do not have additional time in their working day to contribute to research. The completion of a Q-sort process for two conditions of instruction meant that time became a major constraint for me and my participants. Accessing teachers in this research was difficult, particularly because of how time-consuming the Q-sort process is. However, without the use of one Q-sort with two conditions of instructions, I wouldn't have been able to ascertain how much the standards agenda influenced teachers' positions on both agendas. Additionally, the initial post Q-sort semi-structured interviews developed data that was comparable only with the findings produced by the Q-sort process. Therefore, I had to return and re-do this stage of data collection with questions that extended from the Q-findings. In a new academic year only 8 of the 26 teachers were available for interview. However, without returning in a new academic year this research wouldn't have findings on how year-specific variables contributed towards changes in teachers' positions on these agendas. I have learnt a lot from using the Q-methodology in my research and I will consider these limitations when using it in future research.

Starting with the initial epistemological decisions I made in this research, I have emphasised how strongly qualitative I am in my sociological-interpretivist stance as a researcher. Therefore, becoming involved in Q-methodology and experiencing a sharply upward trajectory of experiences with Q has challenged my assumptions as a researcher. Having mastered some of the techniques Q has to offer I have re-considered the use of statistical data in qualitative research. In using Q as a methodology I had the option to decide how much statistical data I wanted to use. My research could have been much more dominated by quantitative data or it could have been used in equal measures to qualitative data in a mixed method approach. My research uses statistical data to highlight the commonalities held across participants' positions, subsequently described in detail using qualitative analysis. In doing this, I remain intrinsically attached to my position as a researcher and consider my findings to be inexpressible in statistical data alone. However, the use of Q-methodology ensures that the research resonates with different audiences who may have reservations regarding solely qualitative research. Q as a methodology is used by researchers with vastly contrasting epistemological positions, from those like Block who focus on positivist-

quantitative analysis to Brown who considers the use of Q within interpretivist-qualitative research (Block 1978; Brown 1994-1995). As a consequence, instead of being generalisable, my research is relatable across research paradigms.

Findings and discussion - teachers' positions on the inclusion agenda

Answering research question number one-What are teachers' positions on the inclusive education agenda?

The inclusion agenda Q-sort results

Statistical overview

Twenty-six teachers' Q-sort data were statistically analysed using the PQ method (Eden *et al.,* 2005). This analysis produced three factors that explained 45% of the variance and accounted for 23 of the 26 participants. Following analysis each factor generated its own Q-sort representing a weighted average of the positions of these teachers' who loaded on that factor. The participants within each factor had a significant value of at least 0.32; the three teachers who were exempt from these factors had a position that didn't correlate with any factor with sufficient significance. Once the Q-sort is produced the factor is analysed according to the values given collectively to each Q-statement. These values can be compared to the participants' distribution grid and analysed both statistically and qualitatively (see Appendix 7 for factor analysis data).

Presentational overview

Table 6.1 represents the statistical data generated by statistical analysis for each factor. In a vertical comparison of statement values for each factor, they represent individual factors and collectively develop the same values as the distribution grid. For example: statement 42 of factor one, 'more emphasis is placed on SATs than any other objective' has a statement value of 5 (42; 5). Therefore, factor one's teachers agree with this statement more than any other statement in the Q-sort. The distribution grid in this research is an 11 point scale, ranging from –5 to 5. Values seen as varying in strength of significance within the statistical analysis of these factors are ranked between –5 to –3 and 3 to 5. In doing so, statement 7, 'Statutory Assessment tests are worthwhile for every child', is valued for factor one at –4 (07; -4). Statistically this factor represents these teachers' position that SATs are not worthwhile for

every child. Its value shows that they collectively placed it in the distribution column for the second most significant disagreed statement.

Additionally, by comparing this data horizontally, similarities and differences can be observed between each factor. Comparing and contrasting these factors reveals selections of statements that generate similar values across all three factors. For instance, statement 35, 'In my opinion to be a 'good teacher' the most important aspect of my job is achieving in the league tables' was valued at –5 for all three factors (35; -5). This data is very interesting as it shows that none of these teachers believe being a 'good teacher' equals achieving in the league tables. Looking at the value represented in each of these factors, teachers' position on this statement places it in the most disagreed distribution column. However, as each factor describes a different position there are understandably contrasts when they are compared directly. For example, statement 10, 'I do not believe that every child in this initiative is fully included' generated a difference of opinion between the factors. For teachers in factor one and two this statement wasn't significant for their position. In contrast, those in factor three strongly agreed with the statement and its value, being 5, shows that they felt it belonged in the most agreed section of their distribution grid.

Table 6.1- represents the inclusion agenda's Q-data with the most dominant positions of the distribution grid (see Appendix 8 for full analysis). Results in bold indicate the highest-ranking statements per factor and underlined results identify those ranked the lowest for each factor.

Statements	**Factors**		
	1	2	3
05 I think that all children are considered within this initiative	-1	0	-4
07 Statutory assessment tests are worthwhile for every child	-4	-4	-2
08 I believe that the statementing process helps children…	3	2	2
09 Inclusion … focuses upon the placement of children	2	3	2
10 I do not believe that every child …be fully included	1	0	**5**
12 I believe that children with SEN hinder the education	-2	-2	**4**
13 I don't have enough resources to include children with SEN	3	-1	1
14 I believe that children with SEN needs can be included	-2	-2	-4

15 I believe in the ideological concept of this initiative	3	**4**	3
18 Children with mild SEN find it easier to be included	2	**5**	3
20 There is a lack of support from the Local Authority	**4**	0	0
22 There is enough funding within the school to implement	-3	-4	-1
23 I need more allocated time to implement this initiative	3	2	2
24 I believe that I have adequate training	-3	0	-3
26 I feel pressure to try and fulfil this initiative	0	3	0
28 I feel a moral obligation to fulfil the objectives	1	3	-2
30 My position … is influenced by my experience	2	3	0
33 The p-scale system is of benefit for children with SEN	-1	1	3
35 In my opinion to be a 'good teacher' ...in the league tables	-5	-5	-5
36 In the government's opinion to be a 'good teacher'…	**4**	**4**	**4**
37 I have to focus my attention on the majority of the class	0	0	3
42 More emphasis is placed on the SATs	5	-3	1
43 I should focus more attention on the children…	-3	-3	1
46 I believe that if all my class do not achieve the 'NA'	-4	-3	-3
47 It is of paramount importance that children achieve	-3	-3	-3
48 There is a need to categorise children according to…	-2	-2	-3

Narrative accounts of each inclusion factor

Factor one: 'I would if I could, but in a standards driven system it's practically impossible'

Demographic account

The amount of variance accounted for is 32% and its eigenvalue is 8.2818, eight times the value needed to be a significant factor. In total, seven teachers with a range of experience, mainly from schools in less affluent locations and teaching year groups up to year three had commonalities that developed this factor. These teachers were:

Charlotte; Y5/6; High SES; 2 years experience
Claire; nursery; Low Socio-economical sector (SES); 13 years experience

Diane; reception; Low SES; 10 years experience
Mia; Y3; Low SES; 8 years experience
Nisha; Y3; Low SES; 4 years experience
Rachel; reception; Low SES; 5 years experience
Victoria; Y2; High SES; 27 years experience

Interpretation of factor one

Teachers in this factor teach in key stage one and, whilst subject to assessment, do not have to prepare their children for the key stage two SAT process that produces league tables. Crucially, these teachers emphasised their belief that, in practice, the standards agenda dominated their professional implementation of inclusion. Statements such as, 'more emphasis is placed on the Statutory Assessment Tests than any other objective' (42; +5) and 'In the government's opinion to be a 'good teacher' is to achieve in the league tables' (36; +4) were in the most dominant places on the distribution grid.

These teachers also showed a professional resistance to the dominance of this agenda in selecting 'in my opinion to be a 'good teacher' the most important aspect of my job is achieving in the league tables' as their most disagreed statement (35: -5). In doing so, these teachers exhibited the contrast between government's perception of a 'good teacher' and their personal beliefs. In fact, these teachers specifically highlighted their disagreement with the SAT process. Statements such as 'Statutory Assessment Tests are worthwhile for every child' (7; -4) and 'I believe that if all my class do not achieve the 'national average' they are failing in their education' (46; -4) were in the second most disagreed distribution. However, these teachers go further, questioning the academic nature of the assessment process, by stating that they do not believe it is of paramount importance for all children to achieve academically (47; -3).

Within this factor there was minimal focus upon the inclusion agenda, which is important for this research as participants were asked to place the statements solely in the context of that agenda. These teachers do believe in the ideological concept of inclusion (15; 3). Specifically linking the inclusion agenda to children with SEN (03; 2), these teachers mainly highlighted practical barriers towards its implementation. These practical barriers included a lack of support from their Local Authority (20; 4), a lack of resources (13; 3), lack of training

(24; -3) and not enough funding (22; -3). With the expression of such barriers it is interesting that these teachers also highlighted that they felt they didn't have enough experience of including children with SEN (41; -2). It appears that, owing to the dominance of the standards agenda, teachers considering this factor believe inclusion focuses upon placement of children with SEN and not on school adaptation for them (09; 2; 16; -2)

Factor two: 'I feel a moral obligation towards inclusion, even though I struggle with practical barriers I face'

Demographic account

The amount of variance accounted for is 8% and its eigenvalue is 1.9502, almost twice the value needed to be a significant factor. In total seven teachers, from different school locations and teaching different years but mainly from schools in less affluent locations, had commonalities in their positions. They were:

Caitlin; Y2; Low SES; 5 years experience
Doreen; Y3; High SES; 30 years experience
Jacky; Y all; Low SES; 22 years experience
Louise; Y4; Low SES; 2 years experience
Rita; Y6; Low SES; 34 years experience
Ruth; reception; Low SES; 2 years experience
Tina; Y5; Low SES; 3 years experience

Interpretation of factor two

These teachers were mainly in schools located in less affluent locations and their positions highlight a moral obligation towards the implementation of inclusion (28; 3). Instead of being influenced by the government, these teachers' positions on the inclusion agenda came from their values of what inclusion means to them (31; -2). They stated strongly that their positions are influenced by their professional experience of inclusion (30; +3) and, importantly, they seem to be able to separate the inclusion agenda from the standards agenda. However, these teachers also believe that inclusion is focused upon children with SEN, rather than the broader sense of inclusion that considers diversity more fully (3; 2). Furthermore,

they believe that the education of these children (11; -1) and their peers (12; -2) isn't suffering because of inclusion, although their position included the view that inclusion focused on the placement of children with SEN into mainstream settings (9; 3). It is understandable that they also think the level of inclusion for children with SEN differs depending on the severity of their impairment (18; 5).

Interestingly, these teachers were the only ones who felt under pressure to try to implement the inclusion agenda's objectives (26; 3) and they too highlighted practical barriers in its implementation. These barriers included the need for more allocated time (23; 2) and a lack of sufficient funding available for inclusion (22; -4). Significantly, they also considered the standards agenda within their position on the inclusion agenda. For these teachers the standards agenda is a barrier in the implementation of inclusion. In this factor they appeared to see the standards agenda as more relevant to the majority of the class, seeming to separate it from the education of children with SEN. As in the responses to factor one, they didn't believe it was of paramount importance for all children to achieve academically (47; -3) or that those who don't achieve the 'national average' are failing in their education (46; -3). They do not think they should focus more on those who will achieve the government's desired 'national average' (43; -3).

As in responses to factor one, these teachers also identified the tension between their measurements of success and those of the standards agenda. By placing 'In the government's opinion to be a 'good teacher' is to achieve in the league tables' as one of their most agreed statements (36; 4). In contrast they also identified 'In my opinion to be a 'good teacher' the most important aspect of my job is achieving in the league tables' as their least agreed statement (35; -5). However, the distinction between this factor and factor one answers is that these teachers do not feel there is a prime emphasis on SATs (42; -3). In fact, they strongly believe that SATs are not worthwhile for every child (7; -4). It appears that, for these teachers, the education of children with SEN can be separated from the assessment objectives of the standards agenda. They are therefore able to disassociate the inclusion agenda from the standards agenda.

Factor three: 'Inclusion sounds lovely in theory, but it has practical consequences for the education of the rest of the class'

Demographic account

The amount of variance accounted for is 5% and its eigenvalue is 1.2019, being valued just over the amount necessary to be seen as a significant factor. In total nine teachers in schools in different locations and teaching different years but mostly having over 10 years experience developed this factor. They are:

Christopher; Y3; High SES; 10 years experience
Edith; Y6; Low SES; 10 years experience
Elizabeth; Y6; Low SES; 16 years experience
Faye; Y3/4; High SES; 10 years experience
Graham; Y4; High SES; 15 years experience
Greg; Y4; High SES; 15 years experience
Hayley; Y3; Low SES; 1-year experience
Helena; Y1/2; High SES; 1-year experience
Lily; Y1-6; Low SES; 5 years experience

Interpretation of factor three

This factor represents elements of both factor one and factor two which, interestingly, means that in these teachers are expressing the consequences of the implementation of inclusion. They believe in the ideological concept of inclusion (15; 3); however unlike respondents to factor two they feel little moral obligation towards its implementation (28; -2). Whilst they see a lack of training as a barrier towards inclusion, their main barrier is strongly identified as the standards agenda. Like both factor one and two respondents, these teachers also highlight a stark difference in their own view (35; -5) of what measures determine who is a 'good teacher' and the government's view (36; 4). However, crucially these teachers see the standards agenda as a barrier because they feel it does not cater for children with SEN. They specifically said that children with SEN could not be included within every aspect of the schooling experience (14; -4). They believe children with SEN have different experiences of

inclusion depending on their level of impairment (18; 3). Finally, these teachers are the only ones who said that they have to focus on the majority of the class to meet their standards objectives (37; 3).

With reference to children with SEN, teachers in this factor believe that not all children need to achieve academically (47; -3) and that children are not failing their education if they don't achieve the 'national average' (46; -3). However, instead of seeing the standards agenda as the problem, these teachers feel that it is inclusion which hinders the education of the whole class (12; 4). Whilst these teachers feel responsible for their children's academic success (38; 2), they don't feel part of the process regarding inclusion (32; -1). Critically, they see inclusion as an externally driven agenda that accounts for the problems they foresee in educating children with SEN and their peers simultaneously.

Discussion comparing the Q-sort data to current literature

The New Labour government advocated the use of standards alongside inclusion for all (Strain and Simkins 2008). However, in discussing the inclusion agenda, the available literature rarely describes the standards agenda and, when mentioned, it is rarely given equal attention (Avramidis and Norwich 2002; George and Clay 2008). The condition of instruction for the inclusion agenda was to place statements relating to respondents' positions solely in relation to the inclusion agenda. Therefore, these teachers could have focused on statements they felt described the inclusion agenda and placed these in the most extreme columns. However, a very significant part of the findings shows the influence of the standards agenda in considering the inclusion agenda. For the teachers in factor one their position on the inclusion agenda was masked by their implementation of the standards agenda. In research focused upon the standards agenda there is great emphasis on the decision to develop that agenda. The three innovations highlighted as perceived constraints to teacher autonomy were the National Curriculum, the SAT assessment process and the high level of public surveillance coming from the use of league tables (Bowers 2004). Additionally, there was an emphasis on teachers having to teach against their own core beliefs (Yarker 2006). Bowers and Meller (2000) highlighted that their teachers felt 'trapped' in a system where they have little professional choice. The findings from this research indicate that this literature based on the standards agenda is also relevant when considering implementation of the inclusion agenda.

Researching the inconsistencies in government's implementation of the inclusion and standards agendas revealed a stronger emphasis on the standards agenda. In fact, in every way these agendas appeared to have been developed and implemented in contrast to one another (Clough 2000; Whitty 2008). The inclusion agenda had an ideological edge. The New Labour government envisaged a future for education in which a very different inclusive system was to be developed. With this ideological concept objectives were flexible and designed for teachers to use as much as possible in their classroom setting (Booth *et al.,* 2000). In contrast the philosophy behind the standards agenda was based on an academic focus on economic growth and the need for drastic change in the education system at that time. Over 18 years successive Conservative governments had provided strict mandatory objectives in the form of the National Curriculum and eventually SATs and league tables. These changes not only had a profound impact upon the education system but also on the teaching profession (Whitty 2008). Following the implementation of the standards agenda anyone wanting to be seen as a 'good teacher' had to conform and achieve these standards.

It is perhaps understandable that the teachers in this study focused so much upon the standards agenda. The teachers in factor one appeared to resist the standards agenda's objectives in a similar fashion to that reported in Bowers and Meller's (2000) research. However they also indicated their belief in the ideological concept of inclusion. They saw the standards agenda as the most prominent practical barrier to inclusion. Their positions also seemed to resonate with Yarker's (2006) research on KS3 English teachers and their need to move away from their core beliefs to implement the standards agenda. These teachers in factor one have extended research in this field, as they not only found that the implementation of the standards agenda dominated their work but also that it affected the implementation of the inclusion agenda. In fact the standards agenda dominated their selection of most agreed and disagreed statements in their inclusion Q-sorts and it therefore had a dramatic impact on their consideration of inclusion objectives. The flexible objectives of the inclusion agenda were too easily lost in such a standards driven system.

The teachers in factor one held a pragmatic position on inclusion, whereas teachers in factor two held a position based on their core beliefs. Following New Labour's development of the ethical socialism ethos within government, the inclusion agenda was meant to embrace change (Blair 2008). This change was not meant to be limited to education but was to change

societal perspectives of diversity and equality. This was a wholly new vision for the future in which there would be an inclusive society that considered social justice and the need to welcome and embrace differences regardless of people's needs (Avramidis and Norwich 2002; Clough 2000).

In the limited research on teachers' positions on the inclusion agenda all of the researchers have so far found that most of their teachers held a pragmatic position on inclusion in that they believe in it but do not feel it is practically possible to fully implement it (Avramidis *et al.*, 2000; Croll and Moses 2003). In these pieces of research the teachers' practical view outweighed their inner belief in inclusion. Importantly, factor two teachers held a dominant personal position on inclusion. They believed in the ideological concept of inclusion and felt that they had a moral obligation to implement it. In fact, they said that the government did not influence their position on the inclusion agenda; their position came from a core belief in the right to include. These teachers believed that they faced practical barriers and did not think children with SEN could be fully included. However, they remained focused upon their core belief in a way that was much more apparent than in previous research: the practical barriers they faced influenced but did not define their position.

Factor three teachers had a combined position that detailed specific aspects of factor one and two positions. These teachers believed in the ideological concept of inclusion but, in contrast to factor two respondents, they felt less moral obligation to implement it. Teachers in factor three saw that the standards agenda and variables directly associated with inclusion, such as funding, prevented inclusion from being a practical possibility. It would appear that their position on inclusion resembles previous research findings on teachers' pragmatic views of inclusion (Avramidis and Norwich 2002).

However, teachers in factor three again extended previous findings by stating their perceptions of the consequences of implementing inclusion. They believed that inclusion had a negative impact on the education of the peers of children with SEN. In previous research one variable that came to influence teachers' position on inclusion was related to the category of a child's SEN. For many teachers in these studies children with physical impairments were easier to include. In contrast, they emphasised the problems they face in trying to include children with behavioural difficulties (Avramidis and Norwich 2002; Clough 1998). Factor three teachers' position on inclusion accepted it at an ideological level but extended

past that to a pragmatic position. Instead of focusing upon children with SEN there appeared to be a practical consideration of all children in regards to inclusion objectives. The inclusion agenda for these teachers still focused upon children with SEN but in considering the impact of inclusion objectives across all children they referred to the effects inclusion can have on the rest of the class in negative terms.

Qualitative analysis of the inclusion agenda data; considering individual Q-sorts alongside teachers' report sheets and post Q-sort semi-structured interviews.

Complexity in teachers' positions on the inclusion agenda that extend beyond the factor analysis process

The use of factor statements in the post Q-sort semi-structured interviews encouraged participants to consider which factor they felt best represented their position, before considering the data produced by the factor analysis process. The factor statements were as follows:

Factor one: Inclusion is based on children with special educational needs being placed into mainstream settings. Anything more is just not possible to fully implement practically. This is due to a number of practical issues, including a lack of resources, support, funding and training, which prevent the school adapting effectively to accommodate their educational needs. At the same time we also have to focus on the standards agenda for our own professional accountability and therefore I can only practically do so much within the inclusion agenda.

Factor two: Inclusion is based on children with special educational needs entering into mainstream settings and the school adapting effectively to accommodate their needs. I believe in the ideological concept and personally strive to include these children within my classroom. However, I have to negotiate practical barriers, such as funding, and I have an obligation to focus on the standards agenda to be seen as a 'good teacher'.

Factor three: I personally believe in the ideological concept for inclusion and the need for schools to adapt to accommodate children with special educational needs. However, practically there are barriers including a lack of funding, lack of resources and an

inappropriate school environment. Because of this there are consequences to the inclusion agenda, these include the negative effects it has upon both the education of children with special educational needs and the way it can hinder the rest of the class.

The responses teachers gave as to which statement they felt represented their position on the inclusion agenda became interesting in their own right. From the eight teachers interviewed at this stage of data collection only one, Louise (Y4; Low SES; 2 years experience) chose the same statement that she helped to develop in the Q-analysis. Louise helped develop factor two, 'I feel a moral obligation towards inclusion, even though I struggle with practical barriers I face'. She stated that she strove to implement the objectives of the inclusion agenda, focusing particularly on the fact that this statement emphasised a belief in the ideological concept behind the agenda (p13; 01:39).

Interestingly, four other teachers also focused on this aspect of the factor two statement. They were:

Claire; Y nursery; Low SES; 13 years experience
Rachel; Y reception; Low SES; 5 years experience
Diane; Y reception; Low SES; 10 years experience
Nisha; Y3 to 2; Low SES; 4 years experience

Each of them actually aided the development of factor one, not factor two. In fact the content of their distribution grids was dominated by the standards agenda, with their factor being summarised as 'I would if I could, but in a standards driven system it's practically impossible'. When discussing the differences between these two factors each of these teachers agreed about the dominance of the standards agenda. However, they were keen to discuss their belief in the ideological concept of the inclusion agenda. Rachel said she attempted to accommodate children with SEN in her classroom (p.2; 1:10). However, along with Nisha (p11; 02:10), Diane (p6; 1:05) and Claire (p.2; 2:10) she saw the standards agenda as a barrier to inclusion. Claire said "You try to do what you can but I do think that, yes you are... governed by everything" (p1; 2:48). Additionally, Diane explained the challenge of being a successful teacher within the agenda's objectives "its pulling you all different ways trying to fit all of these groups in and still build up the good outstanding teacher that you strive to be for every child" (06; 1:05). In fact, whilst these teachers chose to focus on their

belief in inclusion in this segment of the interview, their interviews were dominated by their positions on the standards agenda.

Greg (Y4; High SES; 15 years experience) also selected the factor two statement rather than factor three which he had helped to develop in the Q-analysis. Statistically, factor three, 'Inclusion sounds lovely in theory, but it has practical consequences to the education of the rest of the class' combines the positions of both factor one and factor two. Therefore, it makes sense for Greg to determine that his position resonates with the factor two statement. In his interview Greg focused also on his belief in the ideological concept of inclusion. However, whilst discussing his position on inclusion more generally he also said that the outcome for him is a lack of time to implement the objectives effectively (p20; 04:07).

Interestingly, one teacher who had helped to develop factor two selected the factor three statement. Doreen (Y3 to 6; High SES; 30 years experience) reported feeling that her position had changed since the Q-sort process on the basis of recent experience with children with SEN. From this experience she concluded that inclusion has consequences, especially for children with behavioural difficulties. Finally, Susan (Y5; Low SES; 23 years experience) didn't appear in the Q factors, as her position had insufficient commonalities with the other teachers. On discussing this during interview Susan expressed no surprise about this. She explained that her position on inclusion differs according to a child's SEN (p4; 02:15).

In the additional subjectivity generated through the use of factor statements the responses of these teachers were comparable with their Q-sort factors. However, the majority of them also highlighted aspects of other factors that they felt were important in their position on the inclusion agenda. This data therefore represents the complexity in teachers' positions on the inclusion agenda from an individualistic perspective.

Flexibility of inclusion; teachers' definitions of the inclusion agenda

The understanding of what inclusion entails appeared to differ within these teachers' positions on the inclusion agenda. An influential element in these findings is that four distinctive positions, describing inclusion in very different ways, resonated across all of the participants.

Inclusion is the placement of children with SEN into mainstream settings

For ten of the teachers inclusion focused on the placement of children with SEN into mainstream settings (see Appendix 9a for teachers' demographic information). For most of them their focus on placement was derived from the practical difficulties of educating children with SEN alongside their peers. Diane said that "often initiatives look good on paper but when you have a class of 50 children they are not easy to implement successfully - especially SEN issues". In fact, Helena believed that full inclusion could be detrimental to children with SEN. She said "in my experience it can be very difficult, even distressing for some children to be included fully". There appeared to be a consensus in these teachers' positions that inclusion shouldn't be for all children with SEN. Elizabeth believed that increasing inclusion represented a political move away from the need for special schools. She said that there are "less special school places and more SEN children in mainstream". In comparison, Helena also said that "many special needs children are placed wrongly in mainstream schools".

The standards agenda was seen as excluding children with SEN by three of the participants. Rita described the constraints of the National Curriculum, saying "…time, personnel, a restrictive and demanding curriculum prohibits tailored learning for all". Specifically focusing upon the SAT process, Mia said that she personally "[didn't] believe that progress can be measured for some children with SEN using Statutory Assessment". Additionally, Diane explained that she felt children as young as five, regardless of educational need are labelled as successes or failures by the standards agenda.

Rita was the only participant who believed inclusion was about the placement of children with SEN and mentioned that the degree of inclusion achieved depended upon the child's SEN. She mentioned two types of SEN that could lead children to struggle to be included fully, these being physical impairments and behavioural difficulties. She felt that children with physical impairments were prevented from being fully included. For example "a child in a wheelchair cannot fully participate in dance". However, for children with behavioural difficulties she believed that their educational need affected the rest of the class. It appears that, for Rita, the needs of the majority come first and children with particular types of SEN cannot be fully included because of their SEN.

Inclusion involves the school adapting to accommodate children with special educational needs

In total seven teachers believed that the inclusion agenda provides objectives that mean the school should adapt to accommodate educating children with SEN (see Appendix 9a for teacher demographics). These teachers expressed the greatest diversity of views on the children targeted by inclusion, extending beyond a focus on children with SEN. However, individually, they referred to different types of children; all of these teachers believed that inclusion still focused on children with SEN. Ruth, Caitlin and Graham also saw inclusion as focusing upon disadvantaged children. Jacky and Christopher took the agenda to its furthest point and believed all children are included within its objectives.

For these teachers there was an apparent sense of the responsibility they had to adapt their teaching in order to educate all the children in their class. Christopher said that, as a teacher, he is responsible for his actions and has to educate his class effectively. Additionally, Ruth and Caitlin said that, from the school's perspective, adaptation occurs to accommodate the needs of all children in their care. Interestingly, Jacky said that adaptation for children with SEN has increased as teachers, parents and the general public become more informed about SEN and inclusion.

However, Ruth said that, with this knowledge on inclusion, she experiences pressure to implement not only inclusion, but all agendas within her class. She particularly highlighted the pressure she feels to include children with SEN and those who are gifted and talented in her classroom. Moreover, Susan said that she believes there are consequences in adapting the school environment for inclusive purposes. She explained, "Another year I may feel differently but having a child with limited mobility and a wheelchair has meant that the class's experiences have had to be changed and adapted. We have tried our utmost to accommodate his needs but I fear that the other children have missed out". In doing so, she believes that children with SEN can only be included to a certain degree, "I do feel that we have done our utmost to include pupils who have special needs in all we can. Whenever possible activities are adapted to include children. If they cannot be adapted the activity is changed".

The standards agenda determines the implementation of the inclusion agenda

For five of the participants the standards agenda powerfully dominated their responses, to such an extent that their positions on the definition of inclusion weren't evident on their individual Q-sorts (see Appendix 9a for teacher demographics). Only one of these teachers detailed in the Q-sort the children who should be targeted in inclusion. Graham believed that inclusion is for both children with SEN and disadvantaged children. The other four teachers placed all statements referring to which children are targeted in the neutral part of their distribution grids. Additionally, Faye and Graham didn't state whether they think inclusion means a focus upon placement or on school adaptation. It was therefore difficult to ascertain fully the positions of these teachers solely on the inclusion agenda. Having investigated their individual Q-sorts in detail it appears that inclusion objectives, for them, are implemented through the perspective of the standards agenda.

These teachers appeared to exhibit a great deal of psychological conflict and resistance to conformity with the standards agenda. However, they each felt they had little choice but to meet standards objectives before considering the inclusion objectives. Molly said she experienced "definite clashes between what I have to do and what I think is professionally best for my class". Additionally, Edith explained why she felt there was such a focus upon the standards agenda. "I feel I do have to focus my attention to children who could achieve the national average to protect myself from criticism". In order to protect her professional integrity she felt she had to acknowledge and work to standards agenda objectives. Finally, Nisha described what she felt should happen in place of the standards' externally acknowledged assessment process. She said that "a school should be monitored and assessed on the quality of the education they provide for their pupils not on league tables. A poor performing school (on the league table) could be providing an excellent education, it all depends on pupil's backgrounds/ family experiences and support".

Inclusion can be implemented effectively

Only two out of twenty-six teachers believed that inclusion could be fully implemented to accommodate their children's needs (see Appendix 9a for teacher demographics). For these teachers inclusion is focused on children with SEN and the school is able to adapt to accommodate their educational needs. However, they each had a belief in the effectiveness

of inclusion that was apparently different to that of the other teachers. These teachers said within their Q-sort distributions that they believed full inclusion was indeed possible for children with SEN. In fact, they were the only teachers who whole-heartedly believed that inclusion is wholly beneficial and that they could include children with SEN fully alongside their peers.

The inclusion agenda: providing a specialist education for those with greater educational need

For the majority of the teachers in this research inclusion is focused solely on children with SEN. However, there was a clear discrepancy within individual Q-sorts concerning whether inclusion means providing a specialist education or enabling children with SEN to be included in mainstream education. While 12 teachers believed that children with SEN have a specialist education, there were 12 others with directly opposing views (see Appendix 9b for teacher demographics). Teachers from both positions indicated that children with SEN are not fully acknowledged in the standards agenda. It appears that teachers who believed that children with SEN have a specialist education did so because of the standards agenda. Charlotte said "Obviously, some children cannot succeed in SATs for different reasons so they are not worthwhile and often detrimental to those who will not achieve". Additionally, Faye remarked that, "teaching is about more than league tables, especially for children with SEN".

Teachers who believed children with SEN don't have a specialist education also said that such children are not included fully in the standards agenda. Elizabeth explained, "some of the mainstream National Curriculum is not relevant to children with severe SEN - they should have an education based around their individual needs". Furthermore, Caitlin believed that "children with severe special educational needs cannot access the curriculum" and Rachel explained "I think it would depend on their issue, often they need another person sometimes to manage to stay in mainstream don't they, so sometimes that's a really useful resource: a person with them" (p2; 04:30). Interestingly, Nisha, who said in her Q-sort that children with SEN do not require a specialist education, explained in her interview that children who couldn't access the National Curriculum had a specialist education in mainstream schools (11; 05:00). Greg decided in his Q-sort not to place the statement detailing a specialist education in any of his most dominant columns; however, in interview, he viewed children

who were statemented as having a specialist education (p25; 07:48). It appears that these teachers determined the extent to which children with SEN could be included in the curriculum on the basis of their impairment. For these teachers the child's impairment determined whether they needed enough different provisions to constitute a specialist education.

Child specific variable; teachers different positions on inclusion depending on a child's SEN

In the post Q-sort semi-structured interviews six teachers mentioned specifically the different levels of inclusion that are possible across agendas according to a child's SEN (see Appendix 9c for teacher demographics).

Claire and Susan said that some children with SEN can be catered for in mainstream settings, depending on their SEN. Susan said "I think it depends on what the special educational need is. I think that special needs encompass such a great, a great range to whether it's a physical need, to whether its ability if you like or educational need, or whether it's an emotional need. You know there's so much and they are all clustered under being special educational needs" (p4; 05:14). She went on to discuss two very different scenarios she had recently experienced in her classroom. She described a child with cerebral palsy who is a wheelchair user. Susan reported, "…I'm thinking he probably previously wouldn't have been included in mainstream school, where he actually coped really well" (p4; 2:45). In contrast, she described another child she taught in the previous year who had a greater physical need. She felt that including this pupil in mainstream became more difficult as she progressed through primary years and she subsequently went to a special school (p4; 02:50).

The remaining four teachers named children with specific SEN that they felt were either easier or more difficult to include in their classrooms. Diane commented that she felt children with behavioural difficulties could be catered for in mainstream classrooms, but children with multi-sensory difficulties would need a specialist education within mainstream settings (p6; 06:01). In contrast, Greg and Doreen mentioned the difficulties posed by attempting to include children with behavioural difficulties. Doreen remarked "…I think that if you have got a child with significant behavioural problems then to include them is sometimes of detriment to the rest of the class and as class teacher you have to balance the

needs of the many with the needs of the one" (p24; 02:58). This position was reiterated by Greg who described the extra time needed to teach children with behavioural difficulties and the distinction between their education and the education of the whole class. However, Greg also mentioned children with physical difficulties and those who are globally delayed as being equally difficult to include (p25; 04:36). Doreen also said, in contrast to her position on children with behavioural difficulties, that she felt children with visual impairments, physical difficulties and dyslexia are easier to include (p24; 03:48).

From an analysis of their data it appears that these teachers adapted their positions according to their experiences of each child and the varying degrees of SEN they encountered. As Susan said "…I think in some ways you have to look at the child as an individual and that some children with SEN can be catered for quite well in here. Certainly some children who would have previously had special education can be quite easily accommodated for in the school. Then there are other children who have needs far beyond what my training and facilities within the school [can offer]" (p4; 02:08). Therefore there is no uniform pattern in their positions on these different SENs. In fact, they offer distinctly individualistic perspectives, determined by the needs of each child they attempt to include. It appeared that, for Diane, Susan (04; 02:50) and Greg (p25; 04:36) their position on each individual child's inclusion can change throughout their mainstream education and can widen as they and the other children mature. Diane notes that it's as they grow and develop that their SEN can become more noticeable and maintaining the same level of inclusion can prove difficult (p6; 06:26).

Re-defining inclusion; teachers' practical notion of the inclusion agenda

The practicalities of implementing the objectives of the inclusion agenda were paramount within the post Q-sort interview schedule. Having a clear focus on children with SEN in the Q-sort analysis determined that it was essential to consider further the separated provisions for children with SEN. These findings were significant as teachers in the interviews considered separated systems, such as the statementing process as beneficial and necessary in order to facilitate the practical inclusion of children with SEN into mainstream schools.

The statementing process

The statementing process is used to assess children to determine whether they need additional resources, funding and support. For six of them the statementing process was seen as beneficial for children with SEN. Rather than seeing this process as segregating, they saw it as necessary to bring about effective inclusion (see Appendix 9d for teacher demographics).

In their interviews Claire, Louise and Susan (p4; 07:19) mentioned the benefits of statementing children who need these additional provisions. Claire explained that she felt, for some children, statementing enables them to be educated effectively in mainstream settings (p1; 4:54). Louise also focused on the benefits statementing provides for these children in gaining the funding necessary to support them effectively (p13; 02:00). However, for Greg and Claire there are practical difficulties in gaining a statement for children with varying SEN. Greg said "…in principle it's a good idea because it ensures them of the funding as they go throughout school, um so yes um, but sometimes it seems difficult to obtain a statement for a pupil that you believe really needs it" (p25; 06:00). Additionally, he went on to explain that he was confused by the assessment process, as he felt other children have received a statement when they were more able than pupils who had been refused.

Additionally, Claire stated that the process takes too long to implement in practice. She explained that, from identifying their needs in nursery, "the process, it can be till they get to year one or year two by the time they get a statement or get any support and really you have lost a few good years then" (p1; 5:08). However, in contrast Doreen believes that, while the statementing process is beneficial in allocating funding, support is already taking place in the classroom. Therefore, for her, in the latter part of mainstream schooling, the statementing process gives her funding but is not relevant practically. Interestingly, she highlights that statementing can take up to 6 months, which appears to be vastly different to experience in the earlier educational years as described by Claire. Consequently, Doreen doesn't feel that waiting for a statement affects children's inclusion (p24; 07:23).

There was only one teacher who saw the statementing process as having a negative impact on children with SEN. Nisha (Y3 to 2; Low SES; 4 years experience) reported that whilst she didn't have that much knowledge about the process, she felt statementing labelled these children. Elaborating on this, she said "it doesn't provide any extra support, or any resources

or any kind of courses for teachers to attend to, so you have a statemented child but it's just a label, there's nothing to go with" (03:02). It appears that Nisha's practical experience of statementing has greatly influenced her position on the process and its effects.

The p-scale system

Four teachers discussed their views on the p-scale system during their interviews and each described the benefits of this separated system. The p-scale system is an add-on to the National Curriculum and provides detailed, progressive steps for children who can't achieve the lowest levels of the curriculum (see Appendix 9d for teacher demographics).

Nisha described how the p-scale system provides access to the curriculum for those children who need it (p11; 03:45). Louise viewed the p-scale system as just another form of assessment, used for those who can't achieve level one of the curriculum (p13; 03:50). Claire described the benefits of this system in being able to identify the level of ability of children working below their chronological ages (p1; 06:10), whereas Susan discussed the benefits this system has in being able to demonstrate educational progress. She spoke of a child she had recently taught and assessed using the p-scale system. By using the p-scales she explained "we were able to show she did make progress even though on paper it didn't look like she had". Therefore, it appears that these teachers view p-scales as a system designed for individualised progress. Furthermore, for them this system aids the inclusion of these children by providing a tool to use in assessing and representing their educational abilities.

Barriers towards the practical implementation of inclusion

The variables specifically identified as barriers to inclusion

Five variables were identified across each individual teacher's Q-sort as barriers to practically implementation of inclusion. Each of these variables identified externally appointed resources, support or objectives that contributed to the practical negotiation of inclusion objectives. The most frequently mentioned variable was funding and nine teachers claimed that a lack of funding presented a barrier to inclusion (see Appendix 9e for teacher demographics). Lily added in her report that, "There is generally speaking never enough

funding within school to implement any initiative to the best effect". Thereafter, six teachers felt that there is a lack of support from their Local Authority (LA) to the effective implementation of inclusion.

Five teachers reported that they didn't have enough training to implement inclusion. Nisha explained "I don't feel I have the right, correct amount of knowledge to teach children with SEN. If inclusion is to be successful this support must be provided by schools/LA". Four teachers also believed they didn't have enough resources to implement inclusion. However, Tina (Y5; Low SES; 3 years experience) mentioned in her report that she felt she had enough resources, "I feel resources are adequate if used correctly". Interestingly, Charlotte mentioned, in direct reference to children with SEN, that "So much time, effort and resources are used in catering for SEN children who seem to have more 'rights' than the 'normal' child". Finally, seven teachers indicated that they needed more time to implement inclusion effectively.

There was one variable that didn't present a problem to five teachers in their implementation of inclusion. For these five the school supported them effectively in implementing the inclusion agenda's objectives. Greg said in his report that, "The school provides a great deal of support and listens to ideas and suggestions. [The] SEN coordinator has released time to work on this".

The standards agenda and its impact upon the inclusion agenda

For all of these teachers the constraints of the standards agenda appeared to be viewed as a barrier to inclusion. Crucially, in their reports, some of them detailed the dominance of the standards agenda in relation to inclusion in further depth (see Appendix 9f for teacher demographics). For Mia the dominance of the standards agenda influenced the entire education system. She explained that "Statutory Assessment results are published, the public views schools according to these… the results of such tests remain the focus point for schools". Additionally, Tina detailed the pressure she felt, specifically from the implementation of the standards agenda, "Because I feel a pressure to follow all the initiatives and to meet the 'good' teacher criteria. There feels more pressure to do this than to help children to achieve their potential".

For Elizabeth, Lily and Lola the standards agenda didn't simply dominate how they teach, it provided objectives that don't acknowledge the diversity they have in their classroom. Elizabeth explained that "there still seems to be a feeling that whatever a child's ability, skills, interests they are failing if they do not achieve a certain level by the end of KS2. By putting pressure on them to achieve we are not being 'good teachers' especially if they feel stressed and don't want to come to lessons". Additionally, Elizabeth says, specifically for children with SEN, that "No account is taken of SEN levels/needs of individuals - they are supposed to magically 'disappear' within your percentage of children achieving level four. Yet the government says that SEN children must stay in mainstream- they can't have it both ways!" Lily said "SEN children do not and cannot be fully included within every aspect of the schooling experience. SATs benefit very few children".

Some of these teachers, in their reports, referred to the importance attached to academic attainment in the standards agenda objectives. For Jacky "imbalance now exists between academic and vocational/practical skills". Edith says that this is due to the focus on academic work in the standards agenda and the need for children to achieve the same goals. She said "…too much attention is on league tables, it doesn't consider that some children in some schools will never reach expected standards". In response to the 'national average' level, Graham explained, "I believe league tables do not make me a 'good teacher', children should be encouraged to achieve all they can and not to some arbitrary level dictated by some bureaucrat". He added, "Some children never achieve academically, so what is going to happen to them?"

Additionally, Claire described individual children's progression that isn't recognised within the SAT assessment process. She feels that "just because children do not reach the national average doesn't mean they haven't made progress. It is possible to measure small steps and developmental progress for those who may not be 'average'". Doreen said "If education is about meeting the needs of all learners it MUST recognise that not all children are academic and begin to find ways to recognise success in other areas".

Addressing the needs of the individual versus the whole class; the standards agenda's impact on the inclusion agenda

Importantly, eight teachers used their inclusion agenda reports to describe a distinctive difference between their views of individualised teaching for all children and the whole class approach of the standards agenda (see Appendix 9g for teacher demographics). For four of them the standards agenda prevented the acknowledgement of individual development which they felt should receive appropriate recognition. For Rachel, "It is paramount that the whole child develops not just their abilities academically". Mia also stated that, regarding the standards agenda, "there are always exceptions to the 'rules'. Not everyone/child can fit into a particular box". Doreen reported that the standards agenda "discounts all sorts of factors - social, emotional, educational". Additionally, Christopher said that children are capable of setting their own goals and achieving their own individual development.
However, the other four teachers said that academic dominance moves their focus away from the whole child towards a whole class ethos. Tina said "To meet the 'good' teacher criteria there feels more pressure to do this than to help children to achieve their potential", while Graham explained that "A school, like any business, needs to be accountable to keep standards at the forefront". Charlotte and Nisha explained what they, as teachers, should be able to do to focus more upon the individual child. Nisha proposed that externally published assessment should focus more on the quality of education provided rather than 'national average' test scores, whereas Charlotte said that "Our job should be to help children achieve their potential in all areas, not merely academic". It is therefore understandable that these teachers see the standards agenda as presenting such a barrier to the inclusion agenda. Ideologically, they want to focus on each individual's progress, including that of children with SEN. Instead they feel constrained by the objectives of the standards agenda to consider the progress of the whole class, rather than the whole child.

Teachers' positions on the changes that could be made to increase inclusion in their classrooms

Interestingly, when these teachers were asked in the post Q-sort interviews about the changes they would make to inclusion, their responses centred on additional provision. None of them wished to change the concept of inclusion or the separate provision that was accessible to them. Six of them discussed the changes they would make in detail. For them, increased

inclusion could occur if the government reduced practical barriers to it (see Appendix 9h for teacher demographics). In order to do so they believed it would be necessary to increase the available additional and separate provisions that cater specifically for children with SEN. Additional support, in the form of teaching assistants, was seen as essential by Claire (p1; 08:45), Greg (p25; 09:10) and Louise (p13; 07:00). Additionally, Diane (p6; 07:10) said that externalised support, such as the behavioural support group MERE, aided increased inclusion. More resources were needed by Claire (p1:08:45), Doreen (p24; 10:24) and Nisha (p11; 07:40). For Doreen, these resources would be in the form of computer software specifically designed for children with dyslexia and dyspraxia. More funding was needed, according to Claire (p1; 08:45) and Nisha (p11; 07:40) in order to increase resources and staffing in the classroom. Furthermore, Greg (p25:09:10) suggested that smaller class sizes would benefit inclusion and enhance teachers' ability to account for every child's needs. Regarding the standards agenda, Louise commented that extra time is needed away from standards, "sometimes it's just extra time, it's like you're in a constant rush to live up to the standards and to be able to get the levels" (p13; 07:30).

Discussion combining these qualitative findings with relevant literature

In research on inclusive policies a consistent definition of inclusion which can be used by all has never been developed. In retaining flexibility in the implementation of this agenda, teachers are left to decide how they define inclusion (Ainscow *et al.*, 2006). Teachers in this research defined inclusion in differing ways, representing how flexible such definitions can be. Eleven of them stated that inclusion focused upon the placement of children with SEN in mainstream settings, but, in theory, this relates more directly to integration, rather than to inclusion. For almost two decades inclusion is supposed to have superseded integration so that there should now be consideration of how these children may be educated in mainstream settings (Booth *et al.*, 2000).

Following the implementation of the *Excellence for All Children: Meeting SEN* green paper (1997), there is meant to be a focus upon the provisions and support that are available to help children with SEN succeed educationally (Bines 2000). However, Clough's (2000) criticism of this green paper appeared to resonate with these teachers. Clough said that the green paper concentrated on locational inclusion, focused solely on where children were educated and not on provisions within the classroom. Therefore, while, in my research, teachers' positions on

inclusion can be seen as dating back to the integration era, they may also be a consequence of locational inclusion.

Fredrickson and Cline (2002) considered government legislation to focus either on disability or on issues of disadvantage and marginalisation. Moreover, Ainscow and colleagues (2006) said that inclusion can commonly be focused on children with SEN, but can also be considered as relating to all children. In previous research children with physical impairments are seen as more likely to be included in mainstream schools than those with any other educational need (Avramidis and Norwich 2002; Avramidis *et al.*, 2000). However, in this research, teachers held individualised positions on children with SEN that were influenced by the nature of each child's SEN. In fact Diane, Doreen and Greg had contrasting views on whether children with behavioural difficulties could be included in mainstream schools. In doing so, they measured the degree to which inclusion is possible on the basis of the individual child and SEN. Farrell (2010) stated that this form of measurement is based on the medical model, in which where identification of need is based solely 'within' the child, whereas, in a social model, inclusion should focus on the wider context, ensuring that provisions are in place in order to render inclusion effective.

Inclusion, as defined by Hodkinson and Vickerman (2009), requires school adaptation to give provision and support in order for all children to be included in every aspect of the schooling experience. Nine teachers believed that their schools adapted to accommodate the needs of the children they felt were involved in inclusion. However, only two specifically believed that children with SEN could be fully included in mainstream settings. For the overwhelming majority, full inclusion doesn't appear to happen in today's education system. What seemed to be extremely important in these findings was that five teachers were apparently so focused on the standards agenda that I couldn't ascertain their positions on inclusion. As no previous research links these agendas in this way, this data could be viewed in two ways. The teachers could be so overwhelmed by the standards agenda that no other agenda affects their position or they may be so confused by the definition of inclusion that they feel more comfortable detailing their positions on the standards agenda.

Overwhelmingly in this research, the standards agenda appeared negatively within all of the teachers' positions on the inclusion agenda. They either felt that the standards agenda was a further barrier to inclusion or that it provided such constraint that inclusion was impossible.

In relation to the inclusion agenda the main barrier offered by the standards agenda appeared to be SATs and league tables. SATs provide a form of assessment which enables schools to be compared on a national level. Those children who achieve the government's desired 'national average' are represented in their school's positions in the league tables (George and Clay 2008). For all of the teachers in this study, there was consistent disagreement with a public focus on solely academic success. For most of the teachers, focusing upon the standards agenda excludes children who cannot succeed academically. In fact, some children do not undertake the SAT process because they have a profound need that means they physically cannot take the tests (Hodkinson and Vickerman 2009). The teachers in this study all also highlighted that the SAT process is not intended to apply to all children. For ten teachers, the standards agenda imposes such constraints that they feel forced to concentrate upon the majority of the class. For them the standards agenda is not an inclusive system for all.

For twelve of the teachers, children with SEN had a 'specialist' education within mainstream settings which separated them from their peers. Children with SEN can be statemented on entry into mainstream and the curriculum's add-on p-scale system may be applied. They may have a SENCO or a different allocation of resources (Ndaji and Tymms 2010; Northway 1997). Therefore, these teachers perceived these children to have a specialist education because of the additional provision provided specifically for children with SEN. As Clough (2000) stated this different form of provision is justified by their different educational needs and so, in effect, their needs are highlighted as the difference. According to the Warnock Report (1978), since the implementation of integration 20% of children in all classrooms should have some form of SEN (Galloway and Edwards 1991). However, for these twelve teachers it appears that children's SEN dictates a need for a specialist education and determines the provision necessary for them within mainstream settings. The other twelve teachers said that children with SEN do not have a specialist education but many of them indicated that children with SEN could not be included in all aspects of the standards agenda. Instead the curriculum and assessment processes have to be modified to accommodate them (The National Archive 2011).

Therefore, whilst these teachers may not believe that children with SEN need a 'specialist' education, they say that their education continues to be different from that of their peers. There appears to be a myth of adjustment in the pedagogy of children with SEN which becomes apparent when these two agendas are researched together. Because inclusion means

that schools need to adapt to accommodate the needs of children with SEN, it appears that the system remains designed for the majority in the standards agenda. In order to accommodate children with SEN the inclusion agenda dictates that the original system should be adapted. From an inclusionist perspective this is a very different concept to education and society changing their perceptions of disability. In fact, to be fully inclusive, the education system, including the standards agenda, should change to accommodate the needs of all. Instead separate provisions are attached to existing, unchanged systems such as the National Curriculum so that children with SEN can be included without the system itself changing to accommodate their needs. That is why there is a need for add-on systems such as the p-scale to bridge the gap for children with SEN who cannot meet existing systems' objectives (Avramidis and Norwich 2002; George and Clay 2008).

In previous research, teachers' positions on the inclusion agenda and specific variables, or rather on perceived barriers, to inclusion, are consistent. In such studies teachers state their need for more funding, resources and support (Avramidis and Norwich 2002; Croll 2001). Although there is a small allocation of teachers to each of the variables within my data, these consistencies are apparent within the literature and in my findings. Clough (1998) found that teachers' positions are affected by the amount of resource they can access for inclusion. Teachers in this research also indicated that resources presented a barrier to practical implementation of the agenda that, in turn, affected their positions on inclusion. Additionally, teachers both in this research and in previous research indicated that they needed more training and more time to implement inclusion (Avramidis *et al.*, 2000). Alongside these consistencies comes an understanding of a collective number of variables that appear to form barriers to inclusion. By comparing different pieces of research from the last two decades there appears to be fundamental agreement on barriers to inclusion across different schools and locations.

However, there was some data in this research on variables in barriers to inclusion, which wasn't consistent with previous literature. Teachers in this research highlighted the lack of support, specifically from their LA, not from their school. In fact, five teachers explicitly mentioned that they believe their school supports them adequately with the implementation of inclusion. Additionally, Avramidis and Norwich (2002) found that some teachers would like smaller class sizes to accommodate individual need. However, Greg was the only teacher

within this study to mention this variable. It is possible that the support variable may have produced different data owing to the methodological routes taken.

Northway (1997) stated that children with SEN have a separate entrance system, a separate curriculum and separate educational provisions. Therefore, it was of paramount importance to consider whether these teachers viewed the separated provisions for children with SEN as encouraging or hindering inclusion. Pursuing an inclusive ethos would require the established system for children in mainstream schools to adapt to accommodate children with SEN (Corbett 2000). However, Clough critiqued the *Excellence for All: Meeting SEN* green paper (1997), saying that it did not focus enough on the curriculum that was taught post-inclusion. Separate provisions include the statementing process, which is used for children who may need additional provision to determine their actual educational needs. Using a collection of professionals each child is assessed to determine their placement in the education system and what separate provision is needed. Assessment leads to the allocation of resources and funding to these children so that they can receive an adequate education (Armstrong 2005; Northway 1997). Additionally, the p-scale system is used as an add-on for children who can't achieve the initial levels of the National Curriculum (Ndaji and Tymms 2010). The teachers, with the exception of Nisha, in my research who discussed their views of either statementing or the p-scale system supported the use of these separate provisions. In fact, they believed these provisions increased inclusion and were necessary for the effective inclusion of children in mainstream settings.

Fredrickson and Cline (2002) noted that perceptions of inclusion can focus either on children with SEN and disability, or on all children and on issues of marginalisation. In this research, there appeared to be a definite focus on inclusion in terms of disability and, in turn, on the educational needs of children with different SEN. All of the teachers said that they believed in the ideological concept of inclusion when selecting their factor statements. However, their ideological concept focussed on the inclusion of children with SEN as much as possible in mainstream settings, so that their perspective on inclusion was more practically based than the broader ideological concept.

Inclusion should provide a vision of all children being fully included in every aspect of the schooling experience (Booth *et al.,* 2000). When asked what they would change to enhance inclusion, teachers in this research each identified practical barriers. In fact, there were

separate provisions, specifically for children with SEN, that these teachers wanted to be increased, such as resources, funding and the allocation of staff support. Clough (2000) critiqued the *Excellence for all Children: meeting SEN* green paper (1997) on the basis of what they deemed to be a focus on locational inclusion. Unlike the teachers in this research Clough said that there wasn't a focus on provisions being put in place to increase inclusion; without such provision, inclusion could only be locational. Data from teachers in my research appears to support the idea that inclusion continues to be affected by a lack of these essential provisions and that increasing them would increase inclusion. However, by focusing solely on children with SEN the teachers actually advocated the use of separated provisions for the purposes of inclusion rather than looking at provisions to cater for all children and for full diversity in mainstream schools. A major finding in this research was that inclusion appears to have been re-defined for these teachers so that it specifically focuses on inclusion from a practical perspective rather than from an inclusionist standpoint. Rather than considering the 'inclusiveness' of existing and additional provisions, in order to increase inclusion within mainstream schools these teachers want to increase separate provision.

Findings and discussion - teachers' positions on the standards agenda

Answering research question number two: What are teachers' positions on the standards in education agenda?

The standards agenda Q results

Statistical overview

Twenty-five teachers' Q-sort data was analysed statistically using the PQ method (Eden *et al.,* 2005). Unfortunately Graham (Y4; High SES; 15 years experience) had to be removed from this analysis as he placed the same statements on the distribution grid more than once. This analysis produced two factors that explained 43% of the variance and accounted for all 25 participants, with a significant value of at least 0.36. Following the analysis each factor that resembled a factor in the inclusion agenda analysis generated its own Q-sort, representing the positions of teachers who loaded on that factor (see Appendix 7 for factor analysis data).

Presentational overview

Statistical analysis

Table 7.1 represents the statistical data that generated factors for the standards agenda. As with the inclusion agenda, these values can be compared vertically to explain each individual factor and its developed Q-sort. Factor one offers an example of this, wherein teachers believed that more emphasis is placed on SATs that any other objective (42; 4). Additional comparisons can be made horizontally to investigate the similarities and differences across factors. For instance, for statement 5, factor one teachers disagreed that all children are considered in the standards agenda (05; -4) but factor two teachers did not see this constraint within standards agenda objectives (05; 2).

Table 7.1 represents the standards agenda's Q-data statements, highlighting those found in the dominant columns of the distribution grid (see Appendix 10 for a table including all 48 statements).

	Factors	
Statement	1	2
04 I believe that this initiative focuses on disadvantaged children	-3	-3
05 I think that all children are considered within this initiative	-4	2
07 Statutory assessment tests are worthwhile for every child	-4	-4
10 I do not believe that every child in this initiative… fully included	3	-2
12 I believe that children with SEN hinder the education…	-1	-3
14 I believe that children with SEN can be included	-3	-1
21 There is a lack of support from the school to support me	-3	-2
23 I need more allocated time to implement this initiative	1	**4**
26 I feel pressure to try and fulfil this initiative	**4**	**4**
29 I feel under-acknowledged by the government	2	3
30 My position on this initiative is influenced by my experience	3	3
31 My position on this initiative is influenced by the government's…	-2	3
32 I feel that I am part of the process	1	3
34 I feel that there is too much flexibility within this initiative	-2	-3
35 In my opinion to be a 'good teacher' …achieving in the league table	-5	-5
36 In the government's opinion to be a 'good teacher' is to achieve…	**5**	**5**
39 I feel that I have little choice with how I implement this initiative	3	0
40 I suffer occupational stress due to the conflicts within this initiative	3	0
42 More emphasis is placed on the SATs than any other objective	**4**	**2**
43 I should focus more attention on the children who could achieve…	0	-3
46 I believe that if all my class do not achieve the 'NA' they are failing	-2	-4
48 There is a need to categorise children according to their gender…	-3	1

Narrative accounts of each factor

Factor one: 'I have to conform to the standards agenda even if I personally disagree with it'.

Demographic account

The variance accounted for by this factor is 36% and its eigenvalue is 8.8882, eight times the value needed to be a significant factor. In total 14 teachers, mainly from less affluent locations and teaching year three upwards, with a range of experience, had commonalities that developed this factor. They were:

Caitlin; Y2; Low SES; 5 years experience
Charlotte; Y5/6; High SES; 2 years experience
Diane; reception; Low SES; 10 years experience
Doreen; Y3; High SES; 30 years experience
Edith; Y4; Low SES; 15 years experience
Elizabeth; Y6; Low SES; 16 years experience
Helena; Y1/2; High SES; 1-years experience
Lily; Y1-6; Low SES; 5 years experience
Louise; Y4; Low SES; 2 years experience
Mia;Y3; Low SES; 8 years experience
Molly; Y5; High SES; 3 years experience
Rita; Y6; Low SES; 34 years experience
Susan; Y5; Low SES; 23 years experience
Tina; Y5; Low SES; 3 years experience

Interpretation of factor one

These teachers' positions on the standards agenda centred mainly on their view 'I feel that I have little choice with how I implement this initiative' (39; 3). These teachers did not believe in the ideological concept of the standards agenda (15; -2). Teachers in this factor believed, reluctantly, that the standards agenda dominated their choices in the classroom, in relation to SATs specifically, with statements such as 'More emphasis is placed on the SATs than any

other agenda' (42; 4). Consequently, they felt pressure to implement the standards agenda (26; 4) and tension between their views (35; -5) and the government's views of teacher success (36; 5). While these teachers believed they had support from their schools (21; -3), they felt solely responsible for their success in implementing the standards agenda in practice (38; 2). They also highlighted that they suffered occupational stress from its practical implementation (40; 3).

Furthermore, they believed that not all children are considered within this agenda (05; -4), especially children with SEN (14; -3) and children from disadvantaged backgrounds (04; -3). They also placed the statement 'Statutory assessments are worthwhile for every child' as one of their most disagreed positions (07; -4). They didn't believe these children to be included in the standards agenda or that conventional assessment standards are suitable for all children. It appears that these teachers saw the standards agenda as an external entity that governed their teaching. They believed that they had to focus on the majority of children who can achieve the government's desired 'national average' (37; 2). Essentially they felt that they had little autonomy in their actions and believed that they had to select practical priorities and meet the objectives of the standards agenda.

Factor two: 'I don't agree with all of the standards objectives; however I can use my professional autonomy in their implementation'.

Demographic account

The variance of this factor is 7% and its eigenvalue is 1.8504, almost double the value needed to be a significant factor. In total 11 teachers, mainly teaching up to year three and ranging in school location and years taught, had commonalities that developed this factor. They were:

Christopher; Y3; High SES; 10 years experience
Claire; Y nursery; Low SES; 13 years experience
Faye; Y3/4; High SES; 10 years experience
Greg; Y4; High SES; 15 years experience
Hayley; Y3; Low SES; 1-year experience
Jacky; Y all; Low SES; 22 years experience
Lola; Y6; High SES; 10 years experience

Nisha; Y3; Low SES; 4 years experience
Rachel; Y reception; Low SES; 5 years experience
Ruth; Y reception; Low SES; 2 years experience
Victoria; Y2; High SES; 27 years experience

Interpretation of factor two

In contrast to factor one and of particular significance for this research, these teachers believed they had more control of the standards agenda. They too disagreed with elements of that agenda, like the respondents for factor one, and had a different measurement of teacher success (35; -5) to that of the government (36; 5). Additionally, they did not believe that the SAT process is for all children (07; -4) and stated that there was no focus on children from disadvantaged backgrounds (04; -3). Crucially, they also said that they do not believe in the ideological concept of the standards agenda (15; -2). However, they did not disagree with all aspects of the agenda, believing that all children were acknowledged in its objectives. Therefore, they considered the agenda to include, to some extent, all children in mainstream schools (05; 2). Additionally, they felt that the standards agenda did not hinder the education of children with SEN (11; -2) or their peers (12; -3) although they do state that children with SEN experience different levels of inclusion within the standards agenda (18; 2).

These teachers appeared to take ownership of the agenda and to believe that they had a part to play in its implementation (32; 2). In doing so, they see flexibility in the agenda whereby they can use their professional autonomy to determine what should happen at a practical level to bring the theoretical objectives to reality. In comparison with factor one respondents, these teachers felt pressure to implement the objectives (26; 4) and also believed they were solely responsible in practice (38; 2). Additionally, they said that they felt under-acknowledged by the government for their role in implementing the standards agenda (29; 3). They said they were influenced by the government (31; 3) and also by their own practical experience (30; 3). They did not believe that children who are not able to achieve the 'national average' are educationally failing (46; -4) and they are conscious that they should not focus more on children who can achieve this average (43; -3). As they combine these objectives with their practical positions, they are able to move beyond standards agenda objectives and they seem to be able to implement these objectives alongside their own professional objectives.

Discussion of the Q-sort data and relevant literature

Within the limited published research on teachers' positions on the standards agenda, the findings emphasise the strict objectives encountered by teachers (Quicke 1988). For instance, Bowers (2004) discovered that teachers felt there was little room for them to make their own decisions and so they had to focus solely on implementing the agenda's objectives. In comparison, respondents in both of these factors disagreed with the ideological concept of the standards agenda and did not accept the core reasoning behind the implementation of all of its objectives. For the teachers in this research the focus of their disapproval appeared to be the way they are externally measured as teachers. As in Brown *et al.* (1997) their focus was not on the process of using national tests but on the way that national tests are applied. Respondents in both factors disagreed with the use of SATs for all children and said that children are not failing if they don't achieve the national average. Importantly, it appears that whilst the government measures success against 'national averages', the teachers in this research did not see children who fell below the national average as failures. Collectively they did not measure their success as teachers on the basis of the standards agenda (Barton 1987).

Counter to previous research findings, a significant finding in this research, only half of the teacher respondents indicated that they felt constrained by the standards agenda to the extent that they had no room to exercise professional autonomy. There was a division amongst the teachers in this research, based upon whether the standards agenda's objectives constrained their practical abilities or provided an element of flexibility. So far the research conducted in this area has mainly focussed on conformity within the objectives and this reflects findings in factor one (Bowers 2004). In contrast, Ainscow and colleagues (2006) found that schools experience both constraint and flexibility in implementing the agendas. Teachers in factor two also acknowledged flexibility and believed that they could use their professional autonomy to decide on practical implementation. Teachers in this research found either constraint or flexibility in the practical implementation of the standards objectives.

In addition, the contrasting aspects present within teachers' positions on the standards agenda seem, in this research, also to influence how they react to the agenda professionally. Like Wyse and Torrance's (2009) findings on teachers having to 'prep' their children for the SAT process, respondents in factor one felt they had to focus on children who could achieve the 'national average'. It seems that the need to conform experienced by these teachers had

consequences for them professionally. They felt pressure and occupational stress in implementing the standards agenda. This supports previous research conducted by Quicke (1988) which directly links the standards agenda with teachers' experience of increasing occupational stress. However, in contrast to previous research, factor two respondents felt they had more control and found the flexibility to use their professional autonomy within the objectives. In doing so, they were able to take ownership of the objectives and implement them using their professional integrity. It appears from these findings that the position of the individual teacher is an important influence on how they approach the agenda and, consequently, on their implementation of its objectives.

Qualitative analysis of the standards agenda data; considering individual Q-sorts alongside teachers' report sheets and post Q-sort semi-structured interviews.

Complexity amongst teachers' positions on the standards agenda that extends beyond the factor analysis process

Each teacher was initially presented in their interview with factor statements that depicted the overall position on each developed factor for both agendas. Once determined, semi-structured interview questions were asked that were based on their responses. The standards agenda statements were as follows:

Factor one: I feel I have little choice but to conform to a system I don't agree with. Whilst I have the relevant training and experience in this agenda, I feel torn between my personal and professional positions. Personally I suffer occupational stress due to the practical issues that I face, including a lack of resources. Additionally, there are consequences to this agenda such as the need for me to focus on the majority of the class and the negative impact the agenda has on children with special educational needs. However, professionally I have to adhere to the agenda in order to be seen by the government as a 'good teacher'.

Factor two: I do not believe in the ideological concept of the standards agenda, but I feel that I have a choice in how I implement it. The standards agenda does consider all children; however it makes me focus on the majority of the class to be recognised as a 'good teacher'. Additionally, there are practical barriers such as a lack of funding and support. However, I have a moral obligation to try and achieve within this agenda to the best of my ability.

The majority of these teachers were able correctly to identify the factor they helped develop for the standards agenda. These two factors expressed polar opposite positions of either constraint or flexibility within the objectives of the standards agenda. However, each teacher asked for further detail on the differences in these statements which they saw this as subtle. Susan (Y5; Low SES; 23 years experience) mirrored the results of her Q-analysis by choosing factor one 'I have to conform to the standards agenda even if I personally disagree with it' but, having read the first line of the factor two statement 'I do not believe in the ideological concept' of this agenda', she said she knew that to be her position (p4; 12:45).

The teachers who developed factor two 'I don't agree with all of the standards objectives; however I can use my professional autonomy in its implementation' were:

Claire; nursery; Low SES; 13 years experience
Greg; Y4; High SES; 15 years experience
Nisha; Y3 to 2; Low SES; 4 years experience
Rachel; reception; Low SES; 5 years experience

Claire specifically associated this flexibility with the ethos of the school she teaches in and the fact that she teaches in the early years' department (p1; 10:48), whereas Rachel and Greg detailed the benefits they felt were accessible with the standards agenda. Rachel stated that she felt the factor one statement was "…too harsh, like a system that I don't agree with, obviously I understand that you have got to test children" (p2; 07:25). Moreover, Greg saw the standards agenda as a very useful guide, rather than a series of strict objectives (p20; 10:35).

The remaining three teachers also chose the factor two statement, stating that they felt there was flexibility within standards objectives. However, when discussing why they decided to pick this statement their explanations were very different. They were:

Diane; reception; Low SES; 10 years experience
Doreen; Y3 to 6; High SES; 30 years experience
Louise; Y4; Low SES; 2 years experience

For Diane and Doreen their position on the standards agenda changed according to specific contexts. Diane explained that she could feel constraints or flexibility in the standards objectives according to her cohort of children. She said

> Yes, I think it depends on the cohort of children as well, because you asked me that last year with last year's cohort who were quite a bright cohort, whereas this year they are not so bright, so my opinion may be different because I have had to change and not restrict myself to thinking of that profile because a lot of them won't be scoring on there (p6; 11:15).

In contrast, Doreen's position changed according to whether or not she is being observed. She explained "…it would depend if OfSTED were watching me or not. If I was being observed than I would say it constrains, um but most of the time I fit into factor two, I make it fit" (p24; 12:57).

Louise's explanation came from her completely different perspective as a newly qualified teacher. She said that her position had actually changed from one of belief in the constraints in factor one to an acceptance of the flexibility described in factor two in the space of a year. She believed this change had occurred because she had grown in confidence and developed her views as a teacher. She explained, "I think I have changed my mind about it because there are objectives that you need to teach, however I feel now being a bit more confident in teaching, having worked here for a few years now, I do kind of swerve it sometimes in my own way" (p13; 09: 55).

It appeared from this data that these teachers' positions were more fluid and interchangeable than could be solely determined on the basis of the Q-analysis. Their positions on the practical implementation of the agenda could diversify across these two factors according to specific variables in their teaching experiences.

Measuring teachers' success; the tension between government's and teachers' perspectives

In total, 17 out of 25 teachers felt there was a clear division between the government's and their own assessment of success (see Appendix 11a for teacher demographics). The government's emphasis on professional accountability and the need to achieve in league tables was discussed by many of these teachers in their reports. Doreen explained why they are seen as important, "LAs, OfSTED, parents look at league tables as indications of success". Additionally, Victoria said that league table results are seen as important and are solely for politicians. In turn, Mia regarded the league table as being "…at the heart of what the government thinks makes a good school/teaching". Accountability appeared to be at the forefront of these teachers' positions on the league table. Rita commented that "…It seems the mark of a 'good teacher' is achieving a high percentage of level 5 and level 4 pupils in SATs, so the school is high up in the league tables".

In total 17 teachers also believed that the SAT process was given more emphasis in the education system than any other aspect. Doreen said in her report that the dominance of SATs overshadowed all other success in schools: "Go on any course, read any government view 'the school is marvellous because … level 5s'". She went further to say that she believes it is a case of "silk purses and sows ears!" because she believes you cannot make a good quality assessment of schools using bad quality tests.

These teachers measured their own success in ways that differ from the SAT process, seeing success in relation to how their children had developed during the year. In doing so, their approach to success was much more individualised and measured personal development, without any focus on the national level. In her report, Tina mentioned the importance of teachers' "children remember the person not their results, this is more important," whereas Doreen said that her role as an educator was to prepare her children for life beyond the education system.

Thirteen teachers described in their reports the importance placed on academic study within the standards agenda (see Appendix 11b for teacher demographics). Additionally, in their Q-sort distributions, only six teachers said they believed that academic achievement was of paramount importance. In terms of a focus on academic success, Molly believes that "there

is a lot of pressure from children included within this initiative to achieve at the same rate as others". In relation to SATs Christopher added that the "national average means very little and success comes in many shapes. Academic success is something, but there are more important things in life". Additionally, Doreen believed that this focus on academic study has consequences: she noted in her report that it has led to a restrictive curriculum and a loss of fun and is producing an "illiterate, disinterested population".

Crucially, in their reports, these teachers mentioned aspects of learning that lie outside the need to succeed academically. For Rita children can be "gifted in other areas, for example art, dance, drama, music, PE, sport…" She said that a "well-balanced, happy, motivated child is sufficient". In order to accomplish this Lily explained that "A 'good teacher' ensures a child receives a holistic, well-rounded education that equips them to deal with life". Additionally, Susan wrote: "Children are not always seen as individuals with needs beyond academic scores… I want to see children growing and developing in all areas. I feel successful if my pupils are happy in school, enjoy their learning and are making appropriate progress". Therefore, these teachers measure their success in their profession directly in relation to each individual child's progress rather than focusing on academic success.

Year specific variable; teachers' different positions on the standards agenda according to the years they teach

Four of these teachers explained changes in their positions, on the standards agenda specifically, in relation to the year they were teaching (see Appendix 11b for teacher demographics).

The post Q-sort interviews were conducted in the academic year following the Q-sort and two teachers had moved year group. Doreen had moved from year 4 to year 6 and so had started to teach her children for the SAT process. Additionally, Nisha had moved from year 3 to year 2 and was now experiencing Key Stage one SATs. These changes to the years they taught had a dramatic impact upon their interviews as they described new experiences of implementing externalised assessment in the standards agenda. Nisha described how teachers across the years feel pressure to develop children for year 2 and 6 tests She explained "come year six it's the tests, so those years get it". Additionally, she described how she felt more

pressure in year 2 than year 3 (p13; 13:00) and Doreen referred to the conflict she now encounters having moved to year 6,

> It's been interesting going to year 6 because obviously I have been involved in the key stage two SATs, which I have been lucky not to be involved in for a few years which has been a godsend … I tried not to make it all about the SATs all year but you have to expose the children to examples of the test and you have to tell them how they are going to be worded and you have to give them practice sessions because it is a completely alien way of doing things unless you have and so that's what's frustrating because that isn't the type of teacher I like to be (p24; 23:40)

Claire's and Diane's experiences of the standards agenda were very different as they both taught in nursery and reception years. Claire thought her perception of the standards agenda was different to that of others who taught in the later years of primary education. She experienced flexibility in the agenda "because we are early years and we are more flexible in the early years, whereas you're more constrained up the school" (p1; 10:45). Diane believed that her position on the standards agenda actually changed according to her cohort each year and their collective educational ability.

It appears that, for these teachers, their positions on the standards agenda are changeable depending on their experiences of both cohort and year group in each academic year. Whether they are experiencing the increased pressure of the externalised SAT process in years 2 and 6 appears to affect their focus and, in turn, their position on the standards agenda. Additionally, for those teachers who did not move to a different year group, there appeared to be a perception that other teachers could be experiencing more pressure in other years. In fact this was the case for teachers such as Susan, who had consistently taught year 5 and Doreen who had moved to teach year 6 and who held the most extreme views of the pressures and constraints present within the standards agenda. Susan disagreed with the standards agenda because "…you are, you are judged so much on results that children are achieving but it's achieving on a set of data, which there is so much else that goes on" (p4; 13:15). Doreen, when discussing the league tables against which she is measured, said "I think league tables are lies, damn lies and statistics, they are a joke" (p24; 17:16).

Teachers' disagreement with the use of SATs and the national league tables in the standards agenda

Significantly, most of the teachers highlighted their disagreement with the use of SATs and league tables. In total 16 teachers said that children who do not achieve the desired national average are not failing their education (see Appendix 11b for teacher demographics). Diane indicated in her report that the use of the 'national average' assessment process means that children are seen as successes or failures. Additionally, Victoria stated that progress could be made without a child reaching the 'national average'. In response to those who do achieve the 'national average' Elizabeth explained that, due to the pressure for teachers to achieve, success for the child becomes narrow and short term. In relation to the use of a national league table, Susan and Doreen described the results as a snapshot in time that does not acknowledge a child's overall development. Helena and Edith explain that, for them, teacher assessment provided a better reflection of a child's academic and overall ability and progress. Caitlin said the "SAT process should be scrapped" but Louise acknowledged in her report that "the tests will continue, even if I tried to stop it". Teachers in this research appeared to focus their disagreement with the standards agenda on the way they are externally measured as teachers. These teachers disagreed with this externally measured assessment because they did not believe it accurately accounted for their pupils' educational achievement. These teachers did not say that external, measured assessment should not exist but instead questioned the quality of that assessment.

Ofsted inspections; teachers' reflections on this externalised method of accountability

Following analysis of the Q-sort data it appeared necessary to give further consideration to teachers' positions on Ofsted inspections as another form of externalised assessment within the standards agenda. Interestingly, in line with the data based on the SAT and league table process, seven of the eight teachers in the post Q-sort semi-structured interviews disagreed with aspects of Ofsted inspections (see Appendix 11c for teacher demographics). Three of them mentioned the need for this form of externalised assessment; they were Claire (p1; 14:50), Nisha (p11; 11:30) and Greg (p25; 12:18). Rachel also said that she believed it is nice to be acknowledged for the hard work carried out by teachers and that this is acknowledged in the inspection process (p2; 09:44). Additionally, Doreen said that the new

format of short notice inspections prevents schools making changes to meet Ofsted standards (p24; 17:50). Nisha explained that, in order to achieve in the Ofsted inspection, the school needs a good management team (p11; 11:25).

However three teachers, including Nisha, importantly questioned the quality of the inspections in different ways. Claire was concerned about their consistency and reliability. She said "I just think that it all depends on the team that you get so if they like you, they like the school. I don't think that they are consistent across schools and boroughs and they sometimes get a pre-existing idea of what schools are like and you can't sway them from it" (p1; 14:50). Similarly, Nisha described the differences in inspectors' personalities and how this can influence inspection outcomes (p11; 11:40). Doreen also said that Ofsted inspectors could arrive for inspection with pre-determined views of schools. She explained "…now inspectors come in with an agenda, they know they use your statistics and they already come in saying oh well you're bad at this or you're good, or this is wonderful, but what they don't have from these statistics is the back stories". She went on to state that children's circumstances at the time of their SATs can have a major impact on their results (p24; 15:00).

Three teachers also questioned how realistic Ofsted inspections are in measuring and scoring schools. Doreen described her experiences in last year's SAT process: "what the statistics don't show is that one lost his father suddenly, one lost his gran she died, you know there are all these stories that we know because we work closely with the children, but inspectors don't…" She felt that if Ofsted came to inspect using the previous year's SAT scores, they would have a pre-conceived belief in the under-achievement of the school (p24; 15:00). Moreover, Diane explained that she felt Ofsted focuses a lot on value-added measurements of children's progress, from when they started to when they leave each year. She went further to state that value-added may not be what that individual child needs "…if you have a poor cohort they need you as a mother really, [with] moral guidance, to give them all of that so it's not always academic [work] that they should be judging, it should be the whole child" (p6; 14:14). Specifically focusing on the day the inspection is carried out Claire said that a major judgement is arrived at in one day, that may not directly represent the school's achievements (p1; 15:10).

In contrast to their positions on SAT assessment, these teachers did not disagree with being assessed as an institution. However, they questioned the quality and also the consistency of this assessment across settings.

Teachers' positive reflections on the Early Years Foundation Stage profile (EFYS)/National Curriculum; agreement in the need for a curriculum

Six of the teachers discussed their positions on the EYFS/National Curriculum in post Q-sort semi-structured interviews which were based on the curriculum and year taught (see Appendix 11d for teacher demographics). These teachers collectively discussed positive aspects of the curriculum which were directly related to the flexibility of its objectives. Claire stated, regarding the EYFS, "we use it to fit our children and we don't do it by the book, we do what we know is best and we do what we know works" (p1; 10:28). Diane commented on the vast amount of information that she used solely as guidance (p6; 13:12). In fact, along with Diane, Greg (p25; 12:25) and Nisha (p11; 12:53) also said that they used the National Curriculum as guidance, in effect as a starting point that offers flexibility for a subsequent change to cater for their children. Rachel reflected positively on the developmental stages within the EYFS that enable the demonstration of progress for children at all levels (p2; 08:10).

Greg said that the curriculum was implemented according to how each teacher interpreted its objectives (p25; 10:20). Interestingly, Nisha explained that she believed this form of flexibility has changed since the implementation of the standards agenda. Historically, she believed that teachers felt a greater need to conform to the curriculum and its objectives. However, over time teachers and schools had taken some ownership of these objectives. In doing so, she believed they were now viewed as a baseline, in effect a reference point from which to begin work, rather than a constraint (p11; 12:50). In comparing the EYFS with the National Curriculum, Doreen did say that she felt the National Curriculum could be further broadened, providing more scope and more flexibility. She felt that it could be influenced by the further flexibility she believed to be evident in the EYFS framework (p24; 27:00).

Therefore, these teachers considered the EYFS/National Curriculum to be beneficial for their teaching practice. They did so because they thought the curriculum had enough flexibility in

its objectives. They used their professional autonomy to cater for the individual within the parameters of a working model that structured their teaching.

The inclusion agenda in teachers' positions on the standards agenda

In contrast to the dominance of the standards agenda in teachers' positions on the inclusion agenda, there was, crucially, little mention of inclusion in discussion of the standards agenda. In fact, those teachers who did mention aspects of inclusion mainly placed the relevant statements in the less extreme columns of –2; 2 and –3; 3. In total ten teachers mentioned in their individual Q-sorts that not all children are considered in the standards agenda (see Appendix 11e for teacher demographic). Additionally, nine teachers, including six of the ten said that not every child could be fully included within this agenda. These teachers believed that the standards agenda does not cater for all children. Interestingly, 18 teachers also stated in their individual Q-sorts that it is not appropriate for all children to be included in SATs. They specifically highlighted the SAT process as a product of standards agenda objectives which cannot be fully inclusive as an assessment process.

The National Curriculum was also noted as a constraint in reports from Helena, Charlotte and Doreen, who thought it difficult for all children to access it and said that it was too restrictive to accommodate the diversity of all individual needs. Specifically highlighting the exclusion of children with SEN and those from disadvantaged backgrounds, Louise said that "children with SEN/disadvantage are forgotten". In fact, 11 teachers said that children with SEN cannot be fully included in every aspect of the standards agenda. Additionally, six teachers believed that the education of children with SEN suffers in the standards agenda. However, five teachers explained that, in the context of the standards agenda, the level of inclusion of children with SEN differs depending on their impairment. For these teachers children with SEN cannot be fully included in the standards agenda and, in turn, the standards objectives do not fully consider their needs. For some of these teachers standards agenda objectives hinder the education of these children. Interestingly, some have indicated that the child's educational needs determine the extent to which they can be included in the objectives. For them, the closer these children's educational needs are to those of their peers, the greater is their inclusion in standards agenda objectives.

Discussion relating these qualitative findings to relevant literature

Seventeen teachers in the Q-sort data said there was a tension between their views of professional success and those of the government. Their comments emphasised the SAT process, with 17 teachers also stating that SATs success was regarded as the most important objective of primary education. Gorard, Fitz and Taylor (2001) considered that the standards agenda developed a new 'public managerial state' in which teachers and schools were publically accountable for their actions. The teachers in this research did not protest about being held publically accountable but instead disagreed with how they were measured. The prominence of academic study in the SAT and league table process was discussed by 13 teachers. Stobart (2001) remarked that the SAT process focuses on English, maths and science but Pollard *et al.* (1994) found that teachers took into account learning that was beyond the constraints of the curriculum. Harnett and Newman (2002) also found that teachers emphasised the need for children to be happy and enjoy learning. For the teachers in this research the standards agenda led to a narrow consideration of a child's educational success. As in Pollard *et al.* (1994) they chose to highlight individual progress outside academic study, providing examples such as Rita's statement that children can be "gifted in other areas, for example art, dance, drama, music, PE, sport…" These teachers measured their own success on the basis of progress made by their pupils as individuals, rather than basing it solely on academic achievement.

Fieldings *et al.* (1999) discovered that teachers felt they had to 'prep' their children to survive in this externalised form of accountability. However, four of the teachers in the post Q-sort semi-structured interviews were influenced by the year group they taught and the nature of each academic year's cohort. Understandably these teachers identified an increased pressure to meet SAT targets in year groups that directly worked towards the externalised tests. They did not experience the same consistent pressure to achieve within the standards agenda. Nevertheless there were 16 teachers in the Q-sort process who varied in the years they taught but still disagreed with SATs and national league tables. Their disagreement focused on the use of a 'national average' in the SAT process, which is then represented in league tables. Sixteen teachers believed that children were not necessarily failing in their education if they did not achieve the desired 'national average'. Doreen and Susan said that the SATs consist of measuring a child's progress at a moment in time so that the measurement is time specific. However, looking at the individual child, Victoria mentioned that children can be making

progress in their education without achieving the 'national average'. Diane also highlighted that the use of a 'national average' means that children are seen as either successes or failures. This resonates with the work of Wyse and Torrance (2009) who considered that the SAT process generated narrow success for children. For these teachers the SAT process produced inaccurate data on children's educational progress and insufficiently measured pupil, teacher and school achievement.

Brown *et al* (2002) described Ofsted inspections as a means of assessing a school's ability to achieve national targets. Six of the teachers in the post Q-sort semi-structured interviews identified concerns regarding Ofsted inspections. In comparison to SATs, teachers did not consider this form of inspection to be unnecessary; their concerns focused on their quality and consistency as a national and very public form of assessment. Teachers in this research saw the focus on national comparisons as distracting government from looking at each individual school. Doreen, Diane and Claire explained, that in their opinion, Ofsted inspectors have a pre-determined view of a school that is based primarily on SAT scores. For these teachers the inability of SATs to assess the whole child has an impact on the all round view of the school so that SAT results not only have an impact on league table positions but also can have a detrimental effect on the assessment of school achievement in its entirety.

In contrast to the externally driven forms of assessment the EYFS and National Curriculum were reviewed in a positive light by these teachers. Interestingly, the National Curriculum and EYFS were implemented by the government in order to provide a prescriptive set of subjects, instructing teachers on how and what they should teach (DfE 2008; Harnett and Vinney 2008). Stobart (2001) said the National Curriculum provides strict guidelines which teachers must adhere to. However, the teachers in this research found flexibility within the objectives. Swann and Brown (1997) determined that the National Curriculum does not address the classroom-level issues and, because of this, teachers are left to implement it in ways that reflect their own ideas of day to day practice. However, Harnett and Newman (2002) found that primary teachers were, in general, committed to implementing a broad and balanced curriculum. For teachers in this research the flexibility they found in the curriculum enabled them to use their professional autonomy in its practical implementation. Furthermore, the National Archives (2011) detail the diverse ranges of child development considered within the curriculum, including growth that is spiritual, mental and cultural. Strain and Simkins (2008) pointed to the regulatory format of a curriculum devised at a

national level, that is not based on a pupil-centred approach. However, the teachers in my research saw was positive acknowledgement of non-academic study and, by using their professional autonomy, they adapted agenda objectives to cater for individual development.

Hodkinson and Vickerman (2009) have previously stated that the inclusion agenda is implemented within the constraints of the standards agenda. Indeed, this seems to be the case for all of the teachers in this research as the inclusion agenda was under-represented in their positions on the standards agenda. This is in contrast to their positions on the inclusion agenda where every factor represented varying degrees of influence from the standards agenda. Teachers' positions on the standards agenda didn't take into account an inclusive ethos in teaching. Instead, their focus was on the measurements used to be successful in the standards agenda.

In the minimal attention given to any objectives of the inclusion agenda, ten teachers believed that not all children are considered and 18 believed that it wasn't appropriate for all children to go through the SAT process. Furthermore, 11 teachers stated that children with SEN specifically cannot be fully included in the standards agenda. For the majority of the teachers the externalised assessment process, which is the focus of their positions on the standards agenda and of government measures of their success, is not an inclusive system. Bines (2000) stated that an assumption was made during implementation of the standards agenda that raising standards generally would also raise standards for children with SEN. However, six teachers in this research believed that the education of children with SEN is hindered because of the standards agenda. It appears that for five of them the standards agenda is a system that children with SEN need to adapt to and their success in this depends on their SEN. In fact, crucially for this research, it appears from these findings that teachers in this research perceived the inclusion agenda as focused on children with SEN, whilst the standards agenda is meant for all, with the exception of its externalised assessment process which is intended for those who can achieve academically.

Findings and discussion - teachers' positions on managing the agendas simultaneously

Answering research question three: How do teachers manage these agendas simultaneously?

Statistical overview

Twenty-six teachers' Q-sort data for both the inclusion and standards agendas were analysed together statistically using the PQ method (Eden *et al.,* 2005). Unfortunately Graham's (Y4; High SES; 15 years experience) inclusion position was represented within the analysis but his standards position could not be included as it was in the standards Q analysis because he placed the same statements more than once on the distribution grid. The analysis produced two factors that explained 35% of the variance and accounted for all 26 participants, considering at least one of their positions on either the inclusion or standards agenda (see Appendix 7 for factor analysis data).

Presentational overview

Statistical analysis

This table represents the statistical data that generated factors for the combination of Q-sorts from the inclusion and standards agendas. As in considering the agendas separately, these values can be compared vertically to explain each individual factor and its developed Q-sort.

Table 8.1 shows the combined agenda's Q-data statements, representing those found in the dominant columns of the distribution grid (see Appendix 12 for a table including all 48 statements).

	Factors	
Statements	1	2
04 I believe that this initiative focuses on disadvantaged children	-3	-2
05 I think that all children are considered within this initiative	-3	2
07 Statutory assessment tests are worthwhile for every child	-4	-3
09 Inclusion within the context of this initiative focuses…placement	2	**3**
10 I do not believe that every child in this initiative can be…included	**4**	-1
11 I think that the education of children with SEN suffers…	**3**	-1
12 I believe that children with SEN hinder the education…	-1	-3
14 I believe that children with SEN needs can be included…	-4	-2
18 Children with mild SEN find it easier to be included…	**3**	**3**
22 There is enough funding within the school	-1	-3
23 I need more allocated time to implement this initiative	2	**4**
26 I feel pressure to try and fulfil this initiative	**3**	**3**
28 I feel a moral obligation to fulfil the objectives	0	**3**
30 My position on this initiative is influenced by my experience	**3**	**4**
31 My position on this initiative is influenced by the government's…	-3	1
35 In my opinion to be a 'good teacher' …achieving in the league table	-5	-5
36 In the government's opinion to be a 'good teacher' is to achieve…	**5**	**5**
42 More emphasis is placed on the SATs than any other objective	4	**2**
43 I should focus more attention on the children who could achieve…	-1	-3
46 I believe that if all my class do not achieve the 'NA' …	-2	-4
47 It is of paramount importance that children achieve academically	-2	-4
48 There is a need to categorise children according to their gender…	-3	1

Narrative accounts of each factor

Factor one: 'The education of children with SEN suffers as a consequence of the emphasis on standards'

Demographic account

The variance accounted for by this factor is 28% and its eigenvalue is 14.3059, 14 times the value needed to be a significant factor. In total 17 teachers, teaching different years in different school locations and with varied levels of experience had commonalities that developed this factor. They were:

Caitlin; Y2; Low SES; 5 years experience *standards Q-sort*
Charlotte; Y5/6 ; High SES; 2 years experience *inclusion and standards Q-sorts*
Diane; Y reception; Low SES; 10 years experience i*nclusion and standards Q-sorts*
Doreen; Y3; High SES; 30 years experience *standards Q-sort*
Edith; Y6; Low SES; 10 years experience *inclusion and standards Q-sorts*
Elizabeth; Y6; Low SES; 16 years experience *inclusion and standards Q-sorts*
Faye; Y3/4; High SES; 10 years experience *standards Q-sort*
Greg; Y4; High SES; 15 years experience *inclusion Q-sort*
Hayley; Y1/2; High SES; 1-year experience *inclusion Q-sort*
Helena; Y1/2 ; High SES; 1-year experience *inclusion and standards Q-sorts*
Lily; Y1-6; Low SES; 5 years experience *inclusion and standards Q-sorts*
Louise; Y4; Low SES; 2 years experience *standards Q-sort*
Mia; Y3 ; Low SES; 8 years experience *inclusion and standards Q-sorts*
Molly; Y5; High SES; 3 years experience *inclusion and standards Q-sorts*
Rita; Y6 ; Low SES; 34 years experience *standards Q-sort*
Susan; Y5; Low SES; 23 years experience *inclusion and standards Q-sorts*
Tina; Y5; Low SES; 3 years experience *standards Q-sort*

Interpretation of factor one

Teachers in this factor emphasised the tension they experienced between the government's and their own measures of success (36; 5; 35; -5). Additionally, they identified the pressure they feel to implement government agendas effectively (26; 3). These teachers specifically highlighted the emphasis placed on the SAT process. As this Q analysis combines positions across the inclusion and standards agendas, in this factor it is important to note that teachers said every child is not included in these agendas (10; 4). However, they do not consider the SAT process to be worthwhile for every child (07; -4). Importantly, these teachers saw consequences to the SAT process, whereby children with SEN education are hindered because of the implementation of SATs (11; 3). They considered children with SEN to have different levels of inclusion in publically measured means of assessment, depending on their SEN (18; 3).

Factor two: 'Children with SEN do not have to achieve the same standards, academic achievement is not paramount for all'

Demographic account

The variance accounted for by this factor is 7% and its eigenvalue is 3.5630, three times the value needed to be a significant factor. In total 15 teachers, teaching different years in different school locations and with a variety of experience had commonalities that developed this factor. They were:

Caitlin; Y2; Low SES; 5 years experience *inclusion Q-sort*
Christopher; Y3; High SES; 10 years experience *inclusion and standards Q-sorts*
Claire; nursery; Low SES; 13 years experience *inclusion and standards Q-sorts*
Doreen; Y3; High SES; 30 years experience *inclusion Q-sort*
Graham; Y4; High SES; 15 years experience *inclusion Q-sort*
Greg; Y4; High SES; 15 years experience *standards Q-sort*
Jacky; Y all; Low SES; 22 years experience *inclusion and standards Q-sorts*
Lola; Y6; High SES; 10 years experience *inclusion and standards Q-sorts*
Louise; Y4; Low SES; 2 years experience *inclusion Q-sort*
Nisha; Y3; Low SES; 4years experience *inclusion and standards Q-sorts*

Rachel; reception; Low SES; 5 years experience *inclusion and standards Q-sorts*
Rita; Y6; Low SES; 34 years experience *inclusion Q-sort*
Ruth; reception; Low SES; 2 years experience; *inclusion Q-sort*
Tina; Y5; Low SES; 3 years experience *inclusion Q-sort*
Victoria; Y2; High SES; 27 years experience *inclusion and standards Q-sorts*

Interpretation of factor two

Teachers in this factor considered there to be a tension between their own and the government's means of measuring success (35; -5; 36; 5). Along with factor one respondents they felt pressure to implement government agendas (26; 3). However, it is important to note that these teachers did not see the same consequences in the SAT process that were reported by factor one respondents. Instead they highlighted their disagreement with SATs and do not agree with the need for all children to be included within it. These teachers did not believe in paramount emphasis being placed on academic achievement (47; -4). Additionally, they did not believe SATs worthwhile for every child (7; -3) or that being unsuccessful in achieving the 'national average' means children are failing educationally (46; -4). Specifically considering children with SEN, these teachers did not believe they could be fully included in these initiatives (14;-2). They did not believe that the education of children with SEN suffers (11; -1) but they did consider that children with SEN have different levels of inclusion, depending on their impairment (18; 3).

Teachers' positions on the inclusion and standards agendas that were included in both of these factors

Six teachers held differing positions on either inclusion or standards agendas that were included in both of these factors. With the exception of Greg (Y4; High SES; 15 years experience), five teachers held their positions of the standards agenda in factor one and their positions of the inclusion agenda in factor two, these teachers were:

Caitlin; Y2; Low SES; 5 years experience
Doreen; Y3; High SES; 30 years experience
Louise; Y4; Low SES; 2 years experience
Rita; Y6; Low SES; 34 years experience

Tina; Y5; Low SES; 3 years experience

Discussion of the combined Q-sort data and relevant literature

In collaborating the inclusion and standards agenda Q-sorts analysis aimed to discover teachers' positions collectively on these two agendas. In fact the data produced only identified the SAT process in relation to the inclusion agenda. For teachers in both factors SATs categorically did not cater for all children and as such was an exclusionary initiative. Ainscow (1999) considered SATs to be inclusive for 80% of the overall population in mainstream education. Bines (2000) said that SATs therefore segregate 20% of children, many of whom have SEN. Brown *et al.* (1997) found that teachers did not consider SATs to be inclusive and in fact thought the process detrimental to the learning of children who do not take the test. In this research, respondents who developed factor one identified that there were consequences to the exclusionary nature of SATs that hinder the education of children with SEN. This directly reflects Ball's (1994) findings from nearly two decades ago, indicating a vulnerability for children with SEN in such an exclusionary system.
Factor two teachers stated that all children do not have to be accounted for in standards. Ainscow and colleagues (2006) said that inclusion could be defined through a focus on children with SEN and disability or by extending coverage to every child and every aspect of marginalisation. However, teachers in factor one concentrated on issues of advantage and marginalisation while primarily considering inclusion to focus on children with SEN. In this factor they considered the educational injustice of excluding children with SEN from the assessment process and how this affects their education. These teachers focus on disability but also consider disability in relation to marginalisation. Factor two teachers focused on inclusion in terms of disability and, importantly, they did not consider it in the context of objectives being inclusive for all. Armstrong (2005) said that inclusion and SEN cannot be applied to manage issues of disability as it conflicts with existing non-inclusive initiatives. Therefore, inclusion can either be seen as necessary in every aspect of the schooling experience or as dependent upon the initiative being discussed and the necessity for all to be included. These factors represent the complexity of individuals' positions in the context of core personal beliefs in inclusion.

A vital finding for this research is that, for six of the teacher, their position on inclusion changed according to whether they were considering it in the context of the inclusion or the

standards agenda. Five of them considered issues of advantage and marginalisation in relation to the standards agenda but focused on disability when solely considering inclusion (Ainscow *et al.*, 2006). For them the concept of inclusion differed for children with SEN compared to their peers. They considered the standards agenda SAT process to be non-inclusive but, when specifically considering inclusion, they focused on children with SEN and determined that they do not need to be included or to succeed in that process.

Implementing the inclusion and standards agendas in tandem: mission impossible?

The Q-sort analysis addressed both the inclusion and the standards agenda as separate entities. Whilst the data indicated that the standards agenda overshadowed the inclusion agenda, it was necessary to determine if the objectives of both agendas could be implemented at the same time. Therefore, simultaneous consideration of these agendas was addressed in the post Q-sort semi-structured interviews. When asked if inclusion and standards agendas' objectives could be implemented together, three of the teachers interestingly questioned the possibility. Doreen said "they think it is", indicating that the government believes it is practically possible (p24; 25:40). However, Nisha said that, in her opinion, they cannot be implemented at the same time in the way they should be (p11: 13:45). Susan explained that she would find it hard to put the objectives together practically while meeting the targets she is measured by (p4:18:00). Rachel went on to say "I wouldn't even know where to start" (p2; 12:20). For these teachers the inclusion and standards agendas are implemented separately as their theoretical objectives clash at a practical level.

For the six teachers who went into more detail on the practicalities of joint implementation the standards agenda was seen as non-inclusive. Greg and Louise (p13: 13:50) said that the government would need to focus more on the child's individual development than on national standards. Greg said "The government needs to accept some children can't match levels of others" (p25:15:45). Susan's response was that she would need a magic wand to be waved and to have an answer appear magically before her. She went on to report that she battles with herself when implementing the objectives of either agenda. At times she feels she has to go more towards the standards agenda objectives because that is what she is measured by. However, she feels that "the heart part of you, and I find the more realistic part of you tend to go more towards the inclusion side". Furthermore, she concluded that she tries to find a balance between the objectives but that, at times, she goes down the "wrong road" perhaps

focusing too much on one or other of the agendas (p4: 18:30). Finally, Doreen commented on the possibility of taking inclusion to its furthest point; she argued that, to do this, the whole child would need to be considered as an individual. She perceived her practical implementation of the agendas as a "balancing act you have as a class teacher because you have got 32 whole children, um and I think if you pursue inclusion to its logical conclusion, then you would have 32 children who were special and needed including" (p24: 09:18). The suggestion that these teachers appear, in practice, to experience a battle between these agendas, fluctuating between concentration on either the inclusion or the standards agenda, is an extremely important finding. Doreen said that, ideologically, inclusion should mean that all children were included. Therefore, the initiatives already in place would need to be changed to embrace all children, including those with SEN.

In fact, four teachers discussed the initiatives within the standards agenda that they felt would need to be changed in order for it to become more inclusive. Interestingly, Claire was the only teacher to mention the SAT process as a non-inclusive standards initiative (p1; 17:00). Strikingly, the other teachers focused on the EYFS/National Curriculum, an initiative that, collectively, they agreed with when focusing solely on the standards agenda. In terms of the EYFS, Diane said that she felt the foundation stage profile did not have point scores low enough to include all children (p6; 15:09). Rachel explained that the National Curriculum scale is non-inclusive because it assumes that all children can reach their chronological age of development (p2: 11:26). In comparison, Nisha said that she found including all children in this process difficult because of their diversity (p11; 15:10). In comments that were similar to Diane's on the EYFS profile, Doreen indicated that she would prefer simpler levels of measurements. She went on to say of those who don't meet the measurements on the curriculum "I can't split myself in two and teach two different things" (p.24; 25:46). These teachers indicated that, for them, the curriculum did not cater for all children and would need to be changed in order to become inclusive.

Discussion relating implementing the inclusion and standards agendas in tandem to relevant literature

Theoretically the two agendas appear to have contrasting objectives and these teachers highlighted the disparities as barriers to practical simultaneous implementation. The inclusion agenda promotes an ideology in which all mainstream educated children participate

in every aspect of the schooling experience (Booth *et al.*, 2000; Sikes *et al.*, 2007). The standards agenda has strict guidelines for teachers in providing a National Curriculum of prescribed subjects, measuring children's achievements and using the results to hold teachers and schools accountable for improved educational outcomes (Stobart 2001). However, Bines (2000) inferred that the *Excellence for All Children: Meeting Special Educational Needs* (1997) green paper proposed that standards were equally applicable for children with SEN. Therefore, following the development of the inclusion agenda, the standards agenda should also have developed to consider the education of all mainstream educated children. For teachers in this research their positions on the inclusion agenda referred directly to children with SEN, while for the standards agenda, they considered the majority, those who could achieve in the externalised assessment process. In fact, it is significant in this research that these agendas were seen as such separate entities that some of the teachers in the post Q-sort interviews had not previously considered the standards agenda from the perspective of inclusion. Crucially, it was not until they considered standards agenda objectives in this way that they saw them as non-inclusive.

Their responses highlighted the fact that they felt they implemented the agendas in an 'either or' scenario, focusing on either the inclusion or standards agenda. Susan encapsulated this in her description of the conflict she felt in being compelled to focus on the standards agenda, by which she is measured as a teacher, while personally wanting to focus on inclusion. The Index for Inclusion (2000) considered inclusion for all children generally and the need to value the education of all. Difference, according to this policy should be viewed positively and the focus should be on educational barriers (Armstrong 2005). Inclusion for the teachers in this research remained locked onto a focus on SEN of a type which, according to Booth *et al.* (2000) predates the Warnock Report (1978). As a consequence of this deficit model, the degree of inclusion that occurs in practice depends on the child's SEN. With reference to the standards agenda, it appears that, for these teachers,' inclusion in the objectives of children with SEN depends on their SEN, rather than the objectives 'accommodating' their education (Hodkinson and Vickerman 2009).

These teachers' consideration of the EYFS/National Curriculum from an inclusive perspective essentially contradicted their original positive reflections when focusing solely on the standards agenda. The EYFS/National Curriculum was apparently viewed as the only standards objectives that could be considered in a positive light because it focused on the

individual and so could be adapted to accommodate the needs of the class. However, when considering the inclusion of all children, four teachers viewed these objectives as not allowing for the use of a single system to consider all children's development. The p-scale system came under scrutiny and was seen as an add-on separate provision for those who couldn't achieve the lowest levels of the curriculum. This echoed the work of Bines (2000) who considered the National Curriculum and SAT processes to have been designed for children who could achieve the 'national average'. In the context of Clough's (2000) research it seems that, for these teachers, there was insufficient inclusive focus on provision and curriculum for children with SEN and that the standards agenda did not develop effectively to encompass the concept of inclusion. Hodkinson and Vickerman (2009) said that inclusion was implemented within the constraints of the standards agenda but, significantly in this research, it appeared that the inclusion agenda is implemented separately to the standards agenda and therefore not considered within standards objectives. Instead of focusing on the standards agenda in the light of inclusion, putting inclusion at centre stage in the standards debate would mean that standards objectives must become inclusive, with inevitable consequences for the National Curriculum and SAT process which would have to change to ensure equal acknowledgement of all children and their educational needs.

Findings and discussion – variables with an impact on how teachers manage the inclusion and standards agendas in tandem

Teacher identity and its impact upon the role of the teacher

When considering teachers' perceived identity in society in the post Q-sort semi-structured interviews, three teachers specifically focused on parental judgement. These teachers were:

Claire; nursery; Low SES; 13 years experience
Doreen; Y3 to 6; High SES; 30 years experience
Susan; Y5; Low SES; 23 years experience

All three of these teachers have significant experience in the teaching profession and each questioned the changes in parental judgement they have witnessed. For Claire, parents judge a school's success on achievement in SATs and the subsequent league tables. Therefore, Claire argued in her response that schools who don't achieve in this externalised assessment process are seen as 'terrible' by prospective parents (p1; 13:01). Additionally, Susan and Doreen indicated a change in parent-teacher communication from discussing concerns to questioning teachers' judgement. Susan had experienced a progressively increase in the number of parents who shouted at her before they heard her opinion of their concerns (p4; 13:54). For Doreen this change appeared to have occurred because of parental empowerment and a societal distrust in teachers' independent ability. Doreen said "I don't think they have [the] respect they used to have, I don't think they trust us to do our jobs, um and I think parents feel more and more empowered to challenge what we say and ask us to justify what we are doing" (p24; 11:50).

Claire explained that parents expected more from her, as a teacher, in areas which were previously seen as part of the parents' remit. For instance, she worked in the nursery year and was having to take more responsibility in areas such as toileting and teaching colours and shapes (p1; 13:20). Additionally, Doreen discussed her dissatisfaction, as a professional, with being questioned in this way. She said "…we are professionals, you wouldn't go to the dentist, I don't like the way you are doing that filling, you don't go to a solicitor and say I don't like the way you are drawing up those deeds, but people think they can wander into the classroom and say well I don't like the way you are teaching division, or why are you doing

that with my child… without trusting that we have actually taught lots of children (p24; 14:00).

Importantly, for four teachers, impact on their teacher identities extended from parental judgement to societal judgement. They were:

Diane; reception; Low SES; 10 years experience
Greg; Y4; High SES; 15 years experience
Louise; Y4; Low SES; 2 years experience
Nisha; Y3 to 2; Low SES; 4 years experience

These teachers were clearly distinguished by the fact that, instead of focusing solely on parents, their responses referred to 'people' or the 'public' generally. Greg said that the public can only see a narrow form of testing and that non-education based people then measure a school according to league table results (p25; 11:28). Diane explained that she felt people should put more faith in the teaching profession (p6; 13:44). Additionally, Nisha discussed how "I don't think people recognise that you are constantly scrutinised and you're constantly observed, which you wouldn't get in any other profession" (p11; 10:00). She went on to say "…it is a shame that we can't be trusted, even though we have the degree and we have done, you know done all the work, it's a shame" (p11; 10:29). Louise said that society generally doesn't know enough about the assessment process to measure teacher success (p13; 10:56).

Interestingly, Susan and Diane both mentioned a belief in the need to be conscientious. Diane said that conscientious teachers want all of their children to make progress and are proud of their individual achievements (p6; 13:44). Susan stated that both teachers and their management need to be conscientious. However, she went on to add that this isn't the case for all teachers and this was why there is a need for accountability (04; 15:00).

Teacher experience: influences according to years of teaching experience

Diane (Y reception; Low SES; 10 years experience) said she felt younger teachers were more torn between their personal and professional positions. She explained that "I think perhaps a younger teacher coming into, they might think more like that, but as an older more established teacher I think you use your own professional judgement and you know what's right for the children so you do get the balance more, rather than doing everything by the book in a way" (p6; 4:00). Diane believed that such autonomy grows and develops in teachers as they become mature and established in their roles. However, an important feature of this research is that all of the teachers felt they had some form of autonomy in both agendas, regardless of how many years' teaching experience they had.

Teachers in the post Q-sort semi-structured interviews who could be seen as in the early stages of their careers were:

Rachel; Y reception; Low SES; 5 years experience
Nisha; Y3 to 2; Low SES; 4 years experience
Louise; Y4; Low SES; 2 years experience

These teachers each discussed how they found autonomy to a certain degree within the implementation of the agendas. However, they each discussed their positions in relation to government objectives and their own professional experience. All three said they felt they didn't have enough experience to develop a position on specific areas of questioning. For instance, Nisha (p11; 03:02) felt that she didn't have enough knowledge about the process of statementing, though personally she felt it labelled children. Additionally, Louise felt that she couldn't comment on children with behavioural difficulties as she had not professionally experienced teaching them (p13; 04:30). Furthermore Rachel, asked whether she would change inclusion agenda objectives, said "I don't know if I know it well enough to make that judgement" (p6; 06:04).

In the post Q-sort semi-structured interviews, three of the teachers, with more than a decade of experience each were able to consider government's objectives separately from their professional identities, instead using their vast practical experience to justify their positions. These teachers were:

Claire; nursery; Low SES; 13 years experience
Diane; reception; Low SES; 10 years experience
Greg; Y4; High SES; 15 years experience

Greg (p25; 13:13) said "well you listen to what they say and then you go and do your own thing, hahaha, no obviously you are tied to what they say, but um it's a bit like how you interpret the curriculum and the standards you know, you have an obligation to your class in how you believe they need to be educated within the framework and you hope that the government will be happy with that as well, you use your professional judgement as well". Additionally, Claire (p1; 10:32) said "we use it to fit our children and we don't do it by the book, we do what we know is best and we do what we know works".

Finally, two of the teachers had taught for over two decades and had therefore started their careers prior to the Education Reform Act (1988) and the implementation of the standards agenda. They were:

Doreen; Y3 to 6; High SES; 30 years experience
Susan; Y5; Low SES; 23 years experience

Significantly, both of these teachers' positions drew heavily on the years of experience they had amassed. They had a reflective way of describing their current educational situations in the context of times past. In doing so, they often went back to their experiences before the standards agenda and expressed the strongest negative associations with the externalised assessment process. Doreen said "…I felt before I had a lot more fun, um, I still believe although I couldn't prove it that my pupils made as good if not better progress, um, I think the standards constrain and narrow the curriculum" (p24; 27:00).

Discussion relating teacher identity and its influence on the implementation of the inclusion and standards agenda to relevant literature

It appears that these teachers had changed their own perceptions of their identities to accommodate the societal pressures of accountability, which they saw as attached to the externalised assessment process. Sachs (2001) stated that teacher identity has never been fixed and is in fact ever changing according to society's perception of teachers. However, for these teachers the impact of the standards agenda appears to have had lasting consequences for their identities as professionals.

Importantly, for all them, whether they focused on parental or societal judgement, they linked this judgement to the externalized assessment process. The development of national league tables was intended to enable the general public to see clearly which schools were succeeding or failing (George and Clay 2008). Their introduction appears to have empowered parents and has meant that, for these teachers, their professional judgement is now routinely questioned. According to Doreen (p24; 11:50), trust and respect for the profession has declined, detracting from teachers' professional status in the decades following the implementation of the standards agenda. For these teachers the pressure of being held externally accountable means they have to earn their professional status by achieving in the externalized assessment process. Consequently, they perceive a 'commercialised,' externally driven identity for their profession which has become intrinsic to teacher identities since the implementation of the standards agenda (Webb *et al.*, 2004).

When considering each individual teacher's development of identity it is evident from this research that each seeks and finds autonomy within the objectives. In fact, as in Bandura's (2001) social learning theory, these teachers respond and act to the same objectives in varying and, at times, contrasting ways. For example, standards agenda factor analysis results represented two contrasting ways of responding to and implementing standards agenda objectives. Teachers in this research were divided, seeing either flexibility or constraint within the same objectives. However, it is important to note that they each found autonomy, either through their own actions, or through retaining their belief systems and determining which parts of the agenda they disagreed with professionally.

It may be the case that these teachers' concept of self, whether they held a high or low self-belief in their own ability, influenced their responses and actions in relation to these objectives (Bandura 2001). Indeed, the scope for different reactions is obvious when teachers' positions in reflecting upon the same objectives are so varied. However, it is also evident that teachers' personal beliefs and values contribute towards the formation of their professional identities and, as such, to the way they implement government objectives (Webb *et al.*, 2006). For instance, teachers' positions on children with SEN and their inclusion were influenced by their underlying beliefs in the value of inclusion, alongside their professional position and experience. Evidently, teachers in this research had varying positions on inclusion that were influenced not only by their professional experience, but by their own personal beliefs. The varying positions identified in looking at teachers' positions on each agenda both separately and simultaneously were influenced by complex considerations of their personal and professional positions.

McNally and colleagues (2008) described becoming a teacher as a journey of self-discovery, where the personal self is developed to incorporate a teacher identity. This journey is seen as a personal struggle in which individuals are challenged to take on a new professional identity. However, the teachers in this research have a diverse range of experiences. As in Day *et al.* (2006) it appears from this research that teachers' positions on their professional identities change across their teaching career. Stoll (1999) said that teachers develop their professional identities by reflecting on their past experience. This was definitely an essential element in this research as teachers used their professional experiences as justifications for their positions on both agendas. Interestingly, the development of these experiences appears teachers to change the connection between professional identity and government objectives over time. For teachers who had minimal teaching experience, their positions on the agendas were intrinsically linked to the government's objectives and to their practical experience thus far (Rachel; Nisha; Louise). However, the three teachers who had over ten years experience were able to consider government agendas separately from their professional identities, relying more on their vast practical experience (Greg; Claire; Diane). Inevitably, Doreen and Susan, each with over two decades experience, described in detail the positions they held that contrasted with the government's agendas. They held the strongest views of all the teachers, particularly on the standards agenda, and were the most torn between what they wanted to do and what they had to do. The fact that they had experienced teaching prior to the Education Reform Act 1988 appeared to be a significant factor in this conflict. As Doreen said, she had

witnessed teaching when it was more fun and she felt she was now constrained by the standards agenda (p24; 27:00). If this was the case, the other six teachers could not adopt the positions expressed by Doreen and Susan, as they had never experienced teaching prior to the 1988 reform.

Festinger (1957) developed his theory of cognitive dissonance on the premise that individuals can hold more than one position on a given subject. If these positions contrast, Festinger proposed that individuals attempt to reduce cognitive dissonance by attempting to achieve some form of consonance. Throughout this research there are examples of teachers holding contrasting positions in two distinctive ways. Firstly, they stated that they personally held different personal and professional positions, both within the Q-sort process and the post Q-sort interviews. However, there appeared also to be some teachers who experienced conflict between their professional and personal positions in relation to what they had to implement professionally according to government objectives. Whether or not a teacher had such conflicting positions appeared to be very individual.

Nevertheless there was one dissonant position that resonated across all of the teachers in this research. Each stated that they professionally disagreed with the externally accountable standards' assessment process, in terms of both SATs and league tables. Whilst these teachers disagreed with this form of measurement, in practice they implemented the objectives. It is questionable why they continue to implement the objectives, when they didn't believe in this form of assessment as an effective measure of their achievements as teachers. Festinger (1957) discussed belief in the context of forced compliance, where individuals can feel forced to behave in a manner that is against their personal self beliefs. He noted that to reduce this dissonance individuals can either change their personal self beliefs, or dissociate their beliefs from their enacted behaviour. For these teachers it appears that their personal, and also their professional positions remained intact, as they continued to articulate their grievances against the objectives. Festinger stated that with forced compliance comes a reward and punishment system that ensures the desired behaviour. For these teachers the justifications for their actions are directly associated with the fact that they are measured by this assessment process. Therefore, an important element in this research is the self-perpetuating cycle of actions in which teachers enact the behaviours demanded by these objectives in order to earn their desired identities as teachers. This identity is in turn reinforced by the judgements of both parents and society on their placement in the league

tables (Tavris and Aronson 2007; Webb *et al.*, 2004). In reflecting upon their identity as teachers, it is therefore understandable that these teachers emphasised the importance of succeeding in the standards agenda. With no comparable public measurement attached to inclusion, it is inevitable that the standards agenda dominates teachers' actions.

Conclusion

Inclusive teaching in a standards driven system

In this study teachers' positions on the implementation of the inclusion and standards agendas are as conflicted as the theoretical objectives of those objectives. In the factor analysis process teachers emphasised the dominance of the standards agenda when asked to focus on their positions on inclusion. Importantly, these teachers could have identified the statements that were more closely aligned to the inclusion agenda and placed them in the most extreme distribution columns. Instead they chose to highlight, negatively, the dominance of the standards agenda and its contrasting objectives in their positions on inclusion. By considering the agendas simultaneously this research has extended previous literature on the constraints of the standards agenda (Yarker 2006). For the teachers in this research these constraints extended beyond the standards agenda itself and had an impact on the objectives of the inclusion agenda. They consistently highlighted the tension they experienced between the ways in which they measured their own success as teachers and government's contrasting focus on academic success. Teachers in these factors either considered the standards agenda to be a barrier to inclusion or believed that its constraints made inclusion impossible.

Redefining inclusion

The inclusion agenda provides objectives which give teachers the freedom to decide their own views and also freedom in how they can implement the objectives within their classrooms. Teachers in this research had complex views of what inclusion means in mainstream primary schools. Firstly, they had different definitions of what inclusion entails, focusing on aspects such as placement in mainstream or school adaptations for children with SEN. Because there is such scope for autonomy within the objectives these teachers had developed their own concept of inclusion that was influenced by their professional experiences. Ainscow *et al.* (2006) found that inclusion is commonly focused on children with SEN and Northway (1997) determined that children with SEN had a separate entrance system, a separate curriculum and separate educational provisions. On the other hand, inclusion, as defined in the Index for Inclusion (2000), focuses on consideration of all children but, crucially, teachers in this research not only focused on children with SEN but redefined inclusion, with a focus on how it could be practically possible. This 'practical'

inclusion focused on disability, highlighting the need to include children with SEN as much as possible in mainstream schools. The teachers acknowledge segregated arrangements, such as the statementing process and p-scale system, as beneficial and necessary if children with SEN were to be included. In fact, in order to increase inclusion, teachers in this research advocated the need to increase segregated arrangements including resources, funding and the allocation of more staff support. They had adapted the concept of inclusion from the 'purist' sense of having an inclusive system for all to making available specialist provisions so that children with SEN can be included.

Studies focused on teachers' positions on the inclusion agenda highlighted teachers' pragmatic positions (Avramidis and Norwich 2002; Croll and Moses 2003). However, in this research no categorisation could adequately cover the complexity that was apparent in teachers' positions. Teachers either held a position that was dominated by standards agenda objectives – one in which moral obligation ruled their practical implementation – or they believed there were consequences in implementing inclusion agenda objectives. For these teachers, the practical implementation of inclusion can have detrimental effects on the rest of the class.

Redefining accountability

The standards agenda has objectives that are strict in the sense that teachers have to adhere to a specific framework provided by the government. Adhering to these objectives is not only part of their job as teachers, it is how they are measured as 'good' teachers. Teachers do not have the autonomy to decide on how they will implement the objectives and, consequently, their positions were directly associated with whether they agreed or disagreed with the objectives. Collectively their main concerns were how they are measured as teachers within the externally driven assessment process. Gorard, Fitz and Taylor (2001) considered that the standards agenda developed a new 'public managerial state' in which teachers and schools had to become publically accountable for their actions. The teachers in this research did not protest against the need for public accountability; they disagreed with the way it is implemented. Significantly, they disagreed with the use of SATs and league tables focused on academic achievement. For the majority of these teachers this concentration on children's attainment excluded consideration of the 'whole' child's achievement. Moreover, many of the teachers interviewed also disagreed with Ofsted inspections because of the way they

measure achievement. Concerns over this form of externalised assessment including querying its consistency and its lack of focus on individualised progress and circumstances. Significantly, with the use of an externally driven assessment process, teachers in this research felt that standards objectives dominated their actions because the measurements they entailed were the basis on which they are judged as teachers.

Studies of teachers' positions on the standards agenda, such as Bowers and Meller (2000) and Yarker (2006) focused on the constraints teachers experience when implementing standards agenda objectives. However, these teachers importantly reported conflicting positions on whether they experienced constraint or flexibility within the standards objectives. Teachers involved in the Q-sort factor analysis were divided in whether they could find autonomy within considering the same objectives. The fact that these teachers reacted with such polarity in their positions is a vital finding of this research; the research highlights the need to consider, individually, how teachers react to and then implement these objectives. How they decide to negotiate different agendas is equally important.

Individualisation and ownership

Whilst teachers have developed their positions on these agendas in different ways there are two themes which cross both agendas. Teachers in this research concentrated on 'individualisation', in acknowledging individual child success and considering the 'whole' child instead of choosing to focus on collective achievement. In doing so, they found additional autonomy within both the inclusion and standards agendas in focusing on individual children and their development. Additionally, they sought 'ownership' of the objectives for both agendas. They seemed to achieve more consonance in their actions when they were able to make decisions and use their professional autonomy actively. Nevertheless teachers' positions were complex and directly related to situational influences. Data from the same teachers in two academic years, enabled this research to represent the complexity in positions that changed according to relationships with a particular child or year group. Inevitably, teachers appeared to adapt their professional positions year on year, learning from previous experiences and also considering new situational circumstances. Indeed their positions developed as they sought to find autonomy in these agendas. For teachers in the early stages of their career their positions were intrinsically connected to government legislation. However, with experience, these teachers relied more on their own practical

experience. These findings suggest that these teachers held very complex positions, influenced by variables that produced ever-changing developments in their positions.

Considering standards and inclusion together

When analysing the Q-sorts of teachers' positions on both the inclusion and standards agendas, factors focused solely on the SAT process and children with SEN. Instead of considering the agendas in their entirety, there was a very narrow focus on contrasting positions regarding the education of children with SEN. The polarity in these teachers' positions originated in whether or not they viewed the education of children with SEN as separate to that of their peers – a position focused on disability – or if they thought children with SEN were excluded from these provisions – a position focused on advantage and marginalisation. Fredrickson and Cline (2002) viewed individuals as having a focus on inclusion that prioritised either disability or advantage and marginalisation. However, in this research the focus changed according to the agenda and also to the children whom teachers were considering. Teachers either believed that the SAT process hindered the education of children with SEN, because it was non-inclusive, or that it was not necessary for them to be included at all. A key finding is that for some of these teachers their position on educating children with SEN changed depending on the agenda they were focused on. These teachers focused on advantage and marginalisation in relation to the standards agenda but on disability in relation to the inclusion agenda. Therefore, they considered the SAT process as a hindrance to the education of children with SEN when focusing on the standards agenda. However, when considering the inclusion of children with SEN, they thought it was not necessary for them to be included in all objectives.

Teachers separation of inclusion and standards

In considering inclusion within the standards agenda, inclusion was barely mentioned and only in relation to the exclusion of children with SEN. Many teachers considered SATs and league tables as not encompassing inclusive objectives. As such, they felt that success for children with SEN in SATs depends on their SEN. In considering the inclusion and standards agendas separately these teachers felt that inclusion focused on children with SEN while standards applied to all children, with the exception of the high profile use of SATs and league tables which were only for those capable of academic achievement. This is

comparable with Fredrickson and Cline's research (2002), cited above. However, in this research, teachers focused on either disability or marginalisation depending on which agenda was being considered.

In theory these agendas should be implemented together if they are to meet their objectives fully. Inclusion means that children should be fully included in all aspects of their education, including those related to standards. In return, the standards agenda holds teachers accountable for their actions and, in doing so, considers the achievements of all children. However, Hodkinson and Vickerman (2009) highlighted that the inclusion agenda is only implemented within the constraints of the standards agenda. A vital finding for this research was that teachers did indeed find constraints in the standards agenda objectives that had an impact on their implementation of inclusion. Nevertheless, when teachers in this research were questioned about these agendas, they experienced difficulty in considering inclusion and standards objectives simultaneously. In fact, in looking at them together for the first time they began to consider the degrees of inclusivity implied by aspects such as the p-scale system and National Curriculum. They viewed the agendas as separate entities, with inclusion focused on children with SEN and their education while standards are mainly focused on the majority who can succeed in the externally accountable assessment process. If inclusion were to be equally prominent and at the forefront of implementing the standards agenda then the latter would need to evolve to consider inclusive practice.

The compliant teacher

This research shows the dominance of the standards agenda in relation to inclusion and the impact that has on teachers' identities. Teachers throughout the Q-sort process focused on standards even when they were meant to be focused on inclusion. Justification for the focus on the standards agenda for these teachers was directly connected with performance measurement and the associated judgements of both parents and society. These teachers felt great pressure to succeed in SATs and league tables even though they did not agree with these forms of measurement. They considered their implementation of these objectives as forced compliance. This concept was described by Festinger (1957) who detailed how individuals can feel forced to behave in a manner contrary to their personal self-beliefs. Teachers in this research discussed how they felt compelled to implement the objectives because that is how they earn their identity as professionals. They have therefore changed

their own perceptions of their identities as teachers to accommodate social pressures of accountability. Inevitably, it appears that the standards agenda promotes a self-perpetuating cycle for these teachers in which their identity is shaped by their place in league tables. There is no such measurement relating to the practical implementation of the inclusion agenda and, influentially for these teachers, 'inclusion' is therefore implemented in a standards driven system. Considering the current government's emphasis on raising standards in order to be internationally competitive, it is likely that standards will remain the focus in education for the foreseeable future (Department of Education 2012b).

Summary and recommendations for future research

By using Q-methodology alongside post Q-sort semi-structured interviews this research has been able to develop findings that extend existing research and contribute to new knowledge. There is a depth to these methods that allows teachers to express fully their positions on both agendas so that the findings on each separate agenda extend relevant literature. Additionally, by using the same Q-sort for both agendas and following analysis with post Q-sort semi-structured interviews this research has been able to consider teachers' positions on implementing the objectives together. It is fascinating that the teachers do not consider them in relation to one another and the findings further demonstrate the dominance of the standards agenda. With the focus on teachers' positions on these agendas, another interesting element in the findings has been reflection on the complexity of teachers' positions and their perceived notions of identity as teachers.

This research highlights, for teachers and policy makers, the importance of teachers' positions on these agendas and how they in turn affect practical implementation. I believe that practitioners could gain further understanding of how these objectives should be considered and implemented practically and in tandem from my research. Furthermore, by embracing the concept of inclusion in its broadest sense, my research has the capacity to influence teachers' positions on inclusion and, in turn, standards agenda objectives. On a practical level the research has highlighted that these teachers did not consider the inclusion and standards agendas in tandem but see them as separate agendas. It is essential for these agendas to be considered simultaneously in theory in order for them to work together practically. At present the educational focus is on standards and ensuring achievement for children, teachers and schools through the externalised assessment process. However, if

inclusion were to be considered of equal importance by policy makers the standards agenda would need to change. In order for the standards agenda to be fully inclusive the National Curriculum and SAT process would need to change so that the same system could have the scope to accommodate all children's educational needs.

Recommendations for future research include further investigation of teachers' positions on these two agendas and particularly of their simultaneous implementation. It would also be of value to research different stakeholders' positions on the two agendas, for example parent and pupil positions. A comparative consideration of the positions of teachers in secondary school would be beneficial in giving a view of these agendas across mainstream education. Ultimately this research determines that consideration of government agendas, such as the standards and inclusion agendas, at a classroom level offers a practical focus on theoretical objectives. Looking at agendas that need to be implemented simultaneously by teachers provides a further depth in research that is focused on practical implementation. It would therefore be appropriate for future research also to look at teachers' positions on the practical objectives of other government agendas, particularly when they need to be implemented in tandem.

Reference list

Adams, A. and Tulasiewicz, W. (1995), in Whitty, G. (2000) Teacher professionalism in new times. *Professional Development in Education.* 26**(2),** pp.281-295.

Adnett, N. and Davies, P. (2005), Competition between or within schools? Re-assessing school choice. *Education Economics.* **13**(1), pp.109-121.

Ainley, P. (2004), The new "market-state" and education. *Journal of Education Policy.* **19**(4), pp.497-514.

Ainscow, M. (1999), in Slee, R. (2001) 'Inclusion in Practice': does practice make perfect. *Educational Review.* **53**(2), pp.113-123.

Ainscow, M., Booth, T. and Dyson, A. (2006), *Improving Schools, developing inclusion.* London: Routledge.

Alexander, R. (2004), 'Still no pedagogy? Principle, pragmatism, and compliance in primary education. *Cambridge Journal of Education.* **34**(1),pp.7-33.

Alexander, R., Rose, J. and Woodhead, C. (1992), in, Harnett, P. and Vinney, M. (2008) (2008) *Understanding Primary Education. Developing professional attributes, knowledge and skills.* Oxon: Routledge. pp.120-138.

Alvesson, M. and Skoldberg, K. (1999), in Sandberg, J. (2005) How Do We Justify Knowledge Produced Within Interpretive Approaches? *Organizational Research Methods.* **8**(1), pp.41-68

Armstrong, D. (1998), in Clough, P. (1998), *Managing Inclusive Education. From Policy to Experience.* London: Sage Publications Inc. pp.31-47.

Armstrong, D. (2005), Reinventing 'inclusion': new Labour and the cultural politics of special education. *Oxford Review of Education.* **31**(1), pp.135-151.

Atay, D. (2007), Beginning teacher efficacy and the practicum in an EFL context. *Teacher Development.* **11**(2), pp.203-219.

Avramidis, E., Bayliss, P. and Burden, R. (2000), "A survey into mainstream teachers' attitudes towards the inclusion of children with special educational needs in the ordinary school in one local education authority." *Educational Psychology* **20**(2), pp.191-211.

Avramidis, E. and Norwich, B. (2002), Teachers' attitudes towards integration/inclusion: a review of the literature. *European Journal of Special Needs Education*, **17**(2), pp.129-147.

Bagley, C. and Woods, P. (1998), in Barton, L. (1998a) *Managing Inclusive Education. From Policy to Experience.* pp.78-92.

Ball, S. (1984), in, Chitty, C. (1989), *Towards a New Education System. The Victory of the New Right.* Sussex: The Falmer Press. pp.20-103.

Ball, S. (1990), *Politics and Policy Making in Education: explorations in policy sociology*. London: Routledge.

Ball, S. (1994), *Educational Reform. A critical and post-structural approach.* Buckingham: Open University Press.

Ball, S. (1999), *Global trends in educational reform and the struggle for the soul of the teacher!*. [online] http://www.leeds.ac.uk/educol/documents/00001212.htm. [accessed 15th March 2011].

Ball, S. (2008), *The educational debate.* Bristol: The Policy Press.

Ball, S. and Goodson, I. (1985), in Day, C., Elliott, B. and Kington, A. (2006) The personal and professional selves of teachers: stable and unstable identities. *British Educational Research Journal.* **32**(64), pp.601-616.

Bandura, A. (1997), in Miller, C. and Major, B. (2000) Coping with stigma and prejudice, psychological review, in, Heatherton, T. (2000) *The Social Psychology of Stigma.* New York: Guilford Press. pp.243-272.

Bandura, A. (2001), Social cognitive theory: An agentic perspective. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology.* **2**(-), pp.21-41.

Banks, O. (1981), *Faces of feminism: a study of feminism as a social movement*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Barker, R. (1972), *Education and Politics.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Barker, B. (2008), School reform policy in England since 1988: relentless pursuit of the unattainable. *Journal of Education Policy.* **23**(6), pp.669-683.

Barry J. and Proops, J.L.R. (1999), in Eden, S., Donaldson, A. and Walker, G. (2005) Structuring subjectivities? Using Q methodology in human geography. *Area.* **37**(4), pp.413-422.

Barton, L. (1987), in Slee, R. (2001) 'Inclusion in Practice': does practice make perfect. *Educational Review*. **53**(2), pp.113-123.

Barton, L. (1998a), in Clough, P. (1998) *Managing Inclusive Education. From Policy to Experience.* London: Sage Publications Ltd. pp.78-92.

Barton, L. (1998b), in Clough, P. and Corbett, J. (2000) *Theories of Inclusive Education. A Student's Guide.* London: Paul Chapman's Publishing. pp.51-54.

Basit, T. (2010), *Conducting research in educational contexts.* London: Continuum international Publishing group.

Bassey, M. (1999), *Case Study Research in Educational Settings.* Buckingham: Open University Press.

Batterson, C. (1999), The changing politics of primary education. *Education 3-13.* –(-), pp.61-65.

BBC (2010), *'One quarter of Schools Boycotted SATs Tests'.* [online] http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/10521289. [accessed 9th September 2009].

Beck, R.N**.** (1979), in Cohen, L., Manion, L. and Morrison, K. (2007) *Research Methods in Education.* (6th ed.). London: Routledge. p.19.

Beijaard, D., Verloop, N. and Vermunt, J. (2000), Teachers' perceptions of professional identity: an exploratory study from a personal knowledge perspective. *Teaching and Teacher Education.* **16**(-), pp.749-764.

Benn, C. and Chitty, C. (1996), *Thirty Years On: Is Comprehensive Education Alive and Well or Struggling to Survive?* London: David Fulton.

Benn, C. and Simon, B. (1972), in, Chitty, C. (2009) *Education policy in Britain.*[2nd ed]. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, pp.171-172.

Benton, T**.** and Craib, I**.** (2001), in Burton, D. and Bartlett, S. (2009) *Key Issues for Education Researchers.* London: Sage Publications Ltd. p.17.

BERA (2004), *Revised Ethical Guidelines for Educational Research.* [online] http://www.bera.ac.uk/files/2008/09/ethica1.pdf. [accessed 9th September 2009].

BERA (2011), *Ethical Guidelines for Educational Research.* [online] http://www.bera.ac.uk/files/2011/08/BERA-Ethical-Guidelines-2011.pdf. [accessed 4th August 2011].

Bines, H. (2000), Inclusive standards? Current developments in policy for special educational needs in England and Wales. *Oxford Review of Education*, **26**(1), pp.21-33.

Birley, G. (1998), *A practical guide to academic research.* London: Kogan Page.

Blair, T. (2008), *Socialism.* Fabian Society.

Blake, R. (1985), *The Conservative Party from Peel to Thatcher*. London: Fontana

Block, J. (1978), *The Q-sort method in Personality Assessment and Psychiatric Research*. USA: Charles C Thomas Publishers.

Block, J. (2003), My unexpected life. Journal of Personality. *Assessment*, **81**(-), pp. 194-208.

Blunkett, D. (1997), in Clough, P. (1998) *Managing Inclusive Education. From Policy to Experience.* London: Sage Publications Inc. pp. 31-47.

Bobbit, P. (2002), in Ainley, P. (2004) The new "market-state" and education. *Journal of Education Policy.* **19**(4), pp.497-514.

Boose, J. (1984), *Personal Construct Theory And The Transfer Of Human Expertise.* [online] www.aaai.org. [accessed 14th September 2009].

Booth, T. and Ainscow, M. (2004), *Index for Inclusion: developing learning, participation and play, in early years and childcare.* Bristol: CSIE.

Booth, T., Ainscow, M., Black-Hawkins, K., Vaughan, M. and Shaw, L. (2000), *Index for Inclusion. Developing learning and participation in schools*. Bristol: Centre for Studies on Inclusive Education.

Booth, T., Nes, K. and Stomstad, M. (2003), *Developing inclusive teacher education*. London: RoutledgeFalmer.

Borland, K. (1991), "That's Not What I Said": Interpretive Conflict in Oral Narrative Research, in Gluck, S. and Patai, D. (1991) *Women's words: The feminist practice of oral history.* NY: Routledge, pp.63-75.

Bowers, T. (2004), 'Stress, teaching and teacher health. *Education 3-13,* 32(3), pp.73-80.

Brennan, M. (1996), in Day, C. (2002), School reform and transitions in teacher professionalism and identity. *International Journal of Educational Research.* **37**(-), pp.677-692.

Brown, M., McCallum, B., Taggart, B. and Gipps, C. (1997), The Validity of National Testing at Age 11: the teachers' view. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy and Practice.* **4**(2), pp.271-294.

Brown, M., Ralph, S. and Brember, I. (2002), Change-linked work-related stress in British teachers. *Research in Education*, **67**(1), pp.1-12.

Brown, S. (1980), in Horwood, J. (2000), The search for Diversity in Male Identity Using Q-Methodology. *Feminism and Psychology,* **10**(4), pp.492-497.

Brown, S. (1991/1992), *A Q Methodological tutorial.* [online] http://facstaff.uww.edu/cottlec/QArchive/Primer1.html [accessed 20th September 2009].

Brown, S. (1993), A Primer on Q Methodology. *Operant Subjectivity.* **16**(3/4), pp.91-138.

Brown, S. (1994-1995), Q Methodology as the foundation for a science of subjectivity. *Operant Subjectivity.* **18**(-), pp.1-16.

Brown, S. (1996), Q Methodology and Qualitative Research. *Qualitative Health Research.* **6**(4), pp.561-567.

Brown, S. (1997), *The History and Principles of Q Methodology in Psychology and the Social Sciences*. [online] campus.murraystate.edu. [accessed 21st September 2009].

Brown, S. (2005), *Q methodology: A sneak preview.* [online] n.vanExel@ErasmusMC.nl. [accessed 21st September 2009].

Brown, G. (2008a), in, Chitty (2009) *Education policy in Britain.*[2nd ed]. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan. P.92.

Brown, S. (2008b), in Webler, T., Danielson, S. and Tuler, S. (2009) *Using Q method to reveal social perspectives in environmental research.* [online] http://seri-us.org/sites/default/files/Qprimer.pdf. [accessed 14th July 2011].

Bryman, A. (2004), *Social research methods* (2nd ed.,) Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Burrell, G**.** and Morgan, G**.** (1979), *Sociological Paradigms and Organizational Analysis.* London: Heineman.

Burt, C**.** (1955), in Brown, S. (1998), *The History and Principles of Q Methodology in Psychology and the Social Sciences*. [online] campus.murraystate.edu. [accessed 21st September 2009].

Burton, D. and Bartlett, S. (2009), *Key Issues for Education Researchers.* London: Sage Publications Ltd.

Callaghan, J. (2009), 'British Labour's turn to socialism in 1931'. *Journal of Political Ideologies.* **14**(2), pp.115-132.

Carlgren, I. (1999), Professionalism and teachers as designers. *Journal of Curriculum Studies.* **31**(1), pp.43-56.

Carr, W. and Hartnett, A. (1996), *Education and the Struggle for Democracy. The politics of educational ideas.* Buckingham: Open University Press.

Carr-Saunders, A. (1928), *Professions: their organization and place in society.* Oxford: The Clarendon Press.

Chapman, C. (2002), Ofsted and School Improvement: teachers' perceptions of the inspection process in schools facing challenging circumstances. *School leadership and Management.* **22**(3), pp.257-272.

Chapman, L. and West-Burnham, J. (2010), *Education for Social Justice. Achieving wellbeing for all*. London: Continuum International Publishing Group.

Chitty, C. (1989), *Towards a New Education System. The Victory of the New Right.* Sussex: Falmer Press.

Chitty, C. (2002), *Understanding schools and schooling.* London: RoutledgeFalmer.

Chitty, C. (2006), A Bad White Paper and a Bad Education Bill. *FORUM.* **48**(1),pp.3-8.

Chitty, C. (2008), The UK National Curriculum: an historical perspective. *FORUM.* **50**(3),pp.343-348.

Chitty, C. (2009), *Education policy in Britain.*[2nd ed]. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Chitty, C. (2012), The Birth of New Labour and the Death of Comprehensive Education. *FORUM.* **54**(2)pp.313-318.

Chitty, C. and Simon, B. (1993), *Education answers back: Critical responses to government policy.* London: Lawrence and Wishart.

Clarke, J**.** and Newman, J. (1997), in Barker, B. (2008) School reform policy in England since 1988: relentless pursuit of the unattainable. *Journal of Education Policy.* **23**(6), pp.669-683.

Clough, P. (1991), in Clough, P. (1998), *Managing Inclusive Education. From Policy to Experience.* London: Sage Publications Ltd.

Clough, P. (1998), *Managing Inclusive Education. From Policy to Experience.* London: Sage Publications Ltd.

Clough, P. (2000), in, Clough, P. and and Corbett, J. (2000) *Theories of Inclusive Education. A Student's Guide.* London: Paul Chapman's Publishing.

Clough, P. and Nutbrown, C. (2002), in, Nutbrown, C. and Clough, P. (2006) *Inclusion in the Early Years.* London: Sage Publications.

Cohen, L., Manion, L. and Morrison, K. (2007), *Research Methods in Education.* London: Routledge.

Cohen, L., Manion, L, Morrison, K. and Bell, R. (2011), *Research Methods in Education.* (7th ed.). London: Routledge.

Cole, B. (2005), 'Good faith and effort?' Perspectives on educational inclusion. *Disability and Society*, **20**(3), pp.331-344.

Coleraine, L. (1990), in, Lawton, D. (1992) *Education and Politics in the 1990s. Conflict or Consensus?* London: RoutledgeFalmer,p.35-36.

Combes, H., Hardy, G. and Buchan, L. (2004), Using Q-methodology to Involve People with Intellectual Disability in Evaluating Person-Centred Planning. *Journal of Applied Research in Intellectual Disabilities*, **17**(-), pp.149-159.

Conquergood, D. (1991), Rethinking Ethnography: Towards A Critical Cultural Politics. *Communication Monographs.* **58**(-), pp.179-194.

Cooper, K. and Olsen, M. (1996), in Day, C., Elliott, B. and Kington, A. (2006) The personal and professional selves of teachers: stable and unstable identities. *British Educational Research Journal.* **32**(64), pp.601-616.

Corbett, J. (1996), *Bad-mouthing: the language of special needs.* London: Falmer

Cresswell, J. (2009), *Research Design. Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches.* London: Sage Publications Ltd.

Croll, P. (2001), Children with statements in mainstream key stage two classrooms: a survey in 46 primary schools. *Educational Review.* **53**(2), pp.137-145.

Croll, P. and Moses, D. (2003), Special educational needs across two decades: survey evidence from English primary schools. *British Educational Research Journal,* **29**(5), pp.731-747.

Cronbach, K.J. and Gleser, G.C. (1954), in Brown, S. (1998) *The History and Principles of Q Methodology in Psychology and the Social Sciences*. [online] campus.murraystate.edu. [accessed 21st September 2009].

CSIE (1989), in Rustemier (2002), *Social and educational justice the human rights framework for inclusion.* Bristol: Centre for Studies on Inclusive Education. p.8.

CSIE (1995), in Clough, P. (1998), *Managing Inclusive Education. From Policy to Experience.* London: Sage Publications Ltd. pp.1-16.

Day, C. (2002), School reforms and transitions in teacher professionalism and identity. *International Journal of Educational Research.* **37**(8), pp.677-692.

Day, C., Elliott, B. and Kington, A. (2006), The personal and professional selves of teachers: stable and unstable identities. *British Educational Research Journal.* **32**(64), pp.601-616.

Denscombe, M. (2003), *The Good Research Guide*. [2nd ed.]. Maidenhead: Open University Press.

Department for Education (DfE) (2008), *Early Years Foundation Stage (EYFS).* [online] *https://www.education.gov.uk/publications/standard/publicationDetail/Page1/DCSF-00261-2008.* [accessed 10th November 2009].

Department for Education (DfE) (2010), *The importance of teaching: head teachers and teachers to drive school improvement.* [online] http://www.education.gov.uk/inthenews/inthenews/a0068667/importance-of-teaching. [accessed 5th December 2010].

Department for Education (2011), *Parents Charter and other information*. [online] http://education.gov.uk/schools/performance/archive/schools_95/sec8.shtml. [accessed 13th March 2011].

Department for Education (2012a), *Education Bill Received Royal Assent.* [online] http://www.education.gov.uk/inthenews/inthenews/a00200186/education-bill-receives-royal-assent. [accessed 15th January 2013].

Department for Education (2012b), *National Curriculum Review Launched*. [online] http://www.education.gov.uk/inthenews/inthenews/a0073149/national-curriculum-review-launched. [accessed 15th January 2013].

Department for Education and Employment (1997), *Excellence For All Children: Meeting Special Educational Needs.* London: DfEE.

Department for Education and Skills (DfES) (2004), *Five year strategy for children and learners*. Norwich: HM Government.

DES (1967), in, Chitty, C. (2009), *Education policy in Britain.*[2nd ed]. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.pp.36-27.

DES (1985), in *Education in England*. [online] http://www.educationengland.org.uk/documents/des/betterschools.html. [accessed 25th September 2009].

DfEE (1996), in, Chitty, C. (2002), *Understanding Schools and Schooling.* London: Routledge. p.45.

DfEE (1997), in Bines, H. (2000), Inclusive standards? Current developments in policy for special educational needs in England and Wales. *Oxford Review of Education*, **26**(1), pp.21-33.

DfES (1998, 1999), Harnett, P. and Vinney, M. (2008), *Understanding Primary Education. Developing professional attributes, knowledge and skills.* Oxon: Routledge. pp.120-138.

DfES (2001), in Armstrong, D. (2005), Reinventing 'inclusion': new Labour and the cultural politics of special education. *Oxford Review of Education.* **31**(1), pp.135-151.

DfES (2003), in Harnett, P. (2008), *Understanding Primary Education. Developing professional attributes, knowledge and skills.* Oxon: Routledge.pp.xi-xiv.

Dryzek, J.S. and Berejikian, J. (1993), in Eden, S., Donaldson, A. and Walker, G. (2005) Structuring subjectivities? Using Q methodology in human geography. *Area.* **37**(4), pp.413-422.

Dunford, J**.** (2007), in Gorard, S. Fitz, J. and Taylor, C. (2001) School Choice Impacts: What Do We Know? *Educational Researcher,* **30**(7), pp.18-23.

Dyson, A. (2001), in Armstrong, D. (2005), Reinventing 'inclusion': new Labour and the cultural politics of special education. *Oxford Review of Education.* **31**(1), pp.135-151.

Eden, S., Donaldson, A. and Walker, G. (2005), Structuring subjectivities? Using Q methodology in human geography. *Area.* **37**(4), pp.413-422.

Education in England (2013), *Excellence in Schools (1997).* [online] http://www.educationengland.org.uk/documents/wp1997/excellence-in-schools.html. [accessed 10th January 2013].

Evans, K. (1985) , in, Chitty, C. (1989), *Towards a New Education System. The Victory of the New Right.* Sussex: The Falmer Press. pp.19-48.

Farrell, M. (2010), *Debating Special Education*. Oxon: Routledge.

Febbraro, A.R. (1995), in Brown, S. (1991/1992). *A Q Methodological tutorial.* [online] http://facstaff.uww.edu/cottlec/QArchive/Primer1.html [accessed 20th September 2009].

Felkins, P.K. and Goldman, I. (1993), in Brown, S. (1991/1992). *A Q Methodological tutorial.* [online] http://facstaff.uww.edu/cottlec/QArchive/Primer1.html [accessed 20th September 2009].

Fenwick, I. (1976), in, Chitty, C. (1989), *Towards a New Education System. The Victory of the New Right.* Sussex: The Falmer Press. p.28.
Festinger, L.(1957), *A Theory of Cognitive Dissonance.* California: Stanford University Press.

Fieldings, S., Daniels, H., Creese, A., Hey, V. and Leonard, D. (1999), The (mis)use of SATs to examine gender and achievement at key stage 2. *Curriculum Journal.* 10(2), pp.169-187.

Fisher, T. (2008), The Era of Centralisation: the 1988 Education Reform Act and its consequences. *FORUM.* **50**(2), pp.255-261.

Flick, U. (2006), *An introduction to qualitative research.* (3rd ed.). London: Sage Publications.

Flude, M. and Hammer, M. (1990), *The Education Reform Act 1988: its origins and implications.* London: Falmer.

Frankfort-Nandmias, C. and Nandmias, D. (1992), *Research Methods in the Social Sciences.* London: Edward Arnold.

Frean, A**.** (2007), in Barker, B. (2008), School reform policy in England since 1988: relentless pursuit of the unattainable. *Journal of Education Policy.* **23**(6), pp.669-683.

Frederickson, N. and Cline, T. (2002), *Special Educational Needs, Inclusion and Diversity: A textbook.* Buckingham. Open University Press.

Gallivan, J. (1994), in Brown, S. (1991/1992). *A Q Methodological tutorial.* [online] http://facstaff.uww.edu/cottlec/QArchive/Primer1.html [accessed 20th September 2009].

Galloway, D., Armstrong, D. and Tomlinson, D. (1998), in Clough, P. (1998), *Managing Inclusive Education. From Policy to Experience.* London: Sage Publications Inc. pp.31-47.

Galloway, D. and Edwards, A. (1991), *Primary school teaching and educational psychology*. London: Longman.

Galton, M., Hargreaves, L. and Comber, C. (1999), Changes in Patterns of Teacher Interaction in Primary Classrooms: 1976-96. *British Educational Research.* **25**(1), pp.23-37.

Gamarnikow, E. and Green, A. (2003), in Vincent, C. (2003), *Social Justice, Education and Identity.* London. RoutledgeFalmer. p.209.

George R. and Clay, J. (2008), Reforming Teachers and Uncompromising 'Standards': implications for social injustice in schools. *FORUM,* **50**(1), pp.103-111.

Gillard, D. (2011), *Education in England: a brief history.* [online] http://www.educationengland.org.uk/history/timeline.html [accessed 10th March 2011].

Glaser, B.S. and Strauss, A.L. (1967), in Eden, S., Donaldson, A. and Walker, G. (2005) Structuring subjectivities? Using Q methodology in human geography. *Area.* **37**(4), pp.413-422.

Glueck, B. (1954), in Brown, S. (1997) *The History and Principles of Q Methodology in Psychology and the Social Sciences*. [online]. campus.murraystate.edu. [accessed 21st September 2009].

Goffman, E. (1959), *The presentation of self in everyday life.* Woodstock: NY.

Goldman, I. (1999), Q methodology as Process and Context in Interpretivism, Communication and Psychoanalytic Psychotherapy Research. *The Psychological Record.* **49**(-), pp589-604.

Goodwin, M. (2011), English Education Policy after New Labour: Big Society or Back to Basics? *The Political Quarterly.* **82**(3), pp.407-424.

Gorard, S. (2005), Academies as the 'future of schooling': is this an evidenced-based policy?. *Journal of Education Policy.* **20**(3), pp.369-377.

Gorard, S., Fitz, J. and Taylor, C. (2001), School Choice Impacts: What Do We Know? *Educational Researcher*, **30**(7), pp.18-23.

Gordan, T. (1986), *Democracy in one school? Progressive Education and Restructuring.* Lewes: FalmerPress.

Gray. S. (2006), *Teachers under siege.* Stoke-on-Trent. Trentham.

Greenhalgh, T., Russell, J. and Swinglehurst, D. (2005), Narrative methods in quality improvement research. *Developing Research and Practice.* **13**(-), pp.443-449.

Grosswiler, P. (1997), in Brown, S. (1991/1992). *A Q Methodological tutorial.* [online] http://facstaff.uww.edu/cottlec/QArchive/Primer1.html [accessed 20th September 2009].

The Guardian (2008), *The SATs question Ed Ball must still answer.* [online] http://www.guardian.co.uk/education/mortarboard/2008/dec/16/sats-questions-ed-balls. [accessed 9th September 2009].

The Guardian (2010), *Primary Heads scupper league tables with out-of-date SATs tests.* [online] http://www.guardian.co.uk/education/2010/may/10/sats-boycott-by-headteachers. [accessed 9th Spetember 2009].

Gunter, H. (2008), Policy and Workforce Reform in England. *Educational Management Administration and Leadership.* **36**(2), pp.253-270.

Habermas, J. (1984), *The Theory of Communicative Action. Reason and the rationalization of society.* MA: Beacon.

Hanlon, G. (1998), in Day, C. (2002) School reforms and transitions in teacher professionalism and identity. *International Journal of Educational Research.* **37**(8), pp.677-692.

Hargreaves, A. (1994), in Day, C., Elliott, B. and Kington, A. (2006), The personal and professional selves of teachers: stable and unstable identities. *British Educational Research Journal.* **32**(64), pp.601-616.

Hargreaves, A. (2000), in Day, C., Elliott, B. and Kington, A. (2006) The personal and professional selves of teachers: stable and unstable identities. *British Educational Research Journal.* **32**(64), pp.601-616.

Hargreaves, D. (1982), in, Chitty, C. (1989), *Towards a New Education System. The Victory of the New Right.* Sussex: The Falmer Press. p.36.

Harnett, P. and Newman, L. (2002), Harnett, P. and Vinney, M. (2008), in Harnett, P. (2008) *Understanding Primary Education. Developing professional attributes, knowledge and skills.* Oxon: Routledge.

Harnett, P. and Vinney, M. (2008), in Harnett, P. (2008), *Understanding Primary Education. Developing professional attributes, knowledge and skills.* Oxon: Routledge. pp.120-138. pp.vi-xiv.

Heine, S. and Lehman, D. (1997), Culture, Dissonance and Self-Affirmation. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin.* **23**(4), pp.389-400.

Higgs, G., Bellin, W., Farrell, S. and White, S. (1998), Educational Attainment and Social Disadvantage: Contextualizing School League Tables. *Regional Studies.* **31**(8), pp.775-789.

Hodkinson, A. and Vickerman, P. (2009), *Key Issues in Special Educational Needs and Inclusion.* London: Sage Publications Ltd.

Hopkins. D. (2007), in Barker, B. (2008), School reform policy in England since 1988: relentless pursuit of the unattainable. *Journal of Education Policy.* **23**(6), pp.669-683.

Horwood, J. (2000), The search for Diversity in Male Identity Using Q-Methodology. *Feminism and Psychology*, **10**(4), pp.492-497.

Howe, K.R. and Moses, M.S. (1999), Ethics in Educational Research. *Review of Research in Education.* **24**(-), pp.21-60.

Hunter, C. (1984), in, Chitty, C. (1989), *Towards a New Education System. The Victory of the New Right.* Sussex: The Falmer Press. pp.34-134.

Hyman, P. (2005), *1 out of 10: From Downing Street Vision to Classroom Reality.* London: Vintage.

Johnson, T.J. (1972), in Webb, R., Vulliamy, G., Hamalainen, S., Sarja, A., Kimonen, E. and Nevalainen, R. (2004) A comparative analysis of primary teacher professionalism in England and Finland. *Comparative Education.* **40**(1), pp.83-107.

Johnstone, D. (2001), *Am Introduction to Disability Studies.* London: David Fulton Publishers.

Jones, J., Jenkin, M. and Lord, S. (2006), *Developing effective teacher performance.* London: Paul Chapman.

Kailin, J. (2002), *Antiracist education: from theory to practice*. Oxford: Rowman and Littlefield.

Kavanagh, D. (1987), *Thatcherism and British politics: the end of consensus?.* Oxford: Oxford.

Kelchtermans, G. (1996), in Kelchtermans, G. (2005) Teachers' emotions in educational reforms: self-understanding, vulnerable commitment and micropolitical literacy. *Teaching and Teacher Education.* **21**(8), pp.995-1006.

Kelly, G. (1963), in Boose, J. (1984), *Personal Construct Theory And The Transfer Of Human Expertise.* [online] www.aaai.org. [accessed 14th September 2009].

Kitzinger, C. (1999), Researching subjectivity and diversity. Q-Methodology in Feminist Psychology. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, **23**(-), pp.267-276.

Knight, C. (1990), *The Making of Tory Education Policy on Post-War Britain 1950-1985.* Lewes: Falmer Press.

Kremer-Hayon, L. (1991), Personal constructs of elementary school principles in relation to teachers. *Research in Education.* **43**(-),pp.15-21.

Kukkonen, M. (2005), in Beauchamp, C. and Thomas, L. (2009) Understanding teacher identity: An overview of issues in the literature and implications for teacher education. *Cambridge Journal of Education.* **39**(2), pp.175-189.

Lacey, P. (2001), The Role of Learning Support Assistants in the Inclusive Learning of Pupils With Severe and Profound Learning Difficulties. *Educational Review.* **53**(2), pp.157-167.

Lasky, S. (2000), The cultural and emotional politics of teacher-parent interactions. *Teaching and Teacher Education.* **16**(8), pp.843-860.

Lasky, S. (2005), A sociocultural approach to understanding teacher identity, agency and professional vulnerability in a context of secondary school reform. *Teaching and Teacher Education.* **21**(8), pp.899-916.

Lawton, D. (1989a), *Education, Culture and the National Curriculum.* London: Hadder and Staughton.

Lawton, D. (1989b), *The Education Reform Act: Choice and Control.* London: Hadder and Staughton.

Lawton, D. (1992), *Education and Politics in the 1990s: conflict or consensus*. London: Falmer.

Lawton, D. (1996), *Beyond the National Curriculum: teacher professionalism and empowerment.* London: Hadder and Staughton.

LeComple, M. and Preissle, J. (1993), *Ethnography and Qualitative Design in Educational Research.* (2nd ed.). California: Academic Press Inc.

Levitas, R. (1998), in Nutbrown, C. and Cough, P. (2006) *Inclusion in the Early Years.* London: Sage Publications. p.3,

Long, T. and Johnson, M. (2000), Rigour, reliability and validity in qualitative research. *Clinical Effectiveness in Nursing.* **4**(-), pp.30-37.

Maclure, S. (1989), in Lawton. D. (1989), *The Education Reform Act: Choice and Control.* London: Hocker and Staughton. pp.5-26.

Mason, M. (2000), *Incurably Human.* London: Working Press.

Mason, J. (2002), *Qualitative Researching.* London: Sage Publications.

McKeown, B. (1990), Q methodology, Communication and the Behavioural Text. *The Electronic of Communication.* **1**(1),pp.-.

McKeown, B. and Thomas, D. (1988), *Q Methodology*. London: Sage Publications.

McNally, J., Blake, A., Corbin, B. and Gray, P. (2008), Finding on identity and meeting a standard: connecting the conflicting in teacher induction. *Journal of Education Policy.* **23**(3), pp.287-298.

Miller, C. and Major, B. (2000), Coping with stigma and prejudice, psychological review, in Heatherton, T. (2000), *The Social Psychology of Stigma.* New York: Guilford Press.-(-),pp.243-272.

Mischler, E.G. (1990), in Flick, U. (2006), An introduction to qualitative research. [3rd ed.]. London: Sage Publications. p.373.

Moen, T. (2006), Reflections on the Narrative Research Approach. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods.* **5**(4), pp.1-11.

Morgan, J. (1981), in, Chitty, C. (1989), *Towards a New Education System. The Victory of the New Right.* Sussex: The Falmer Press. pp.12-19.

Nash, R. (1976), *Classrooms Observed.* London: Routledge.

The National Archives (2011), Records. [online]. *The National Archives*. http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/ [accessed 1 February 2011]

Ndaji, F. and Tymms, P. (2010), The P scales: how well are they working? *British Journal of Special Education.* **37**(4), pp.198-208.

Northway, R. (1997), Integration and Inclusion: Illusion or progress in services for Disabled people?. *Social Policy and Administration*. **31**(2), pp.157-172.

Nutbrown, C. and Clough, P. (2006), *Inclusion in the Early Years.* London: Sage Publications.

Oliver, M. (1996), in Armstrong, D. (2005), Reinventing 'inclusion': new Labour and the cultural politics of special education. *Oxford Review of Education.* **31**(1), pp.135-151.

Papworth, M. and Walker, L. (2008), The needs of primary care mental health service users: a Q-sort study. *Mental Health in Family Medicine.* **5**(4), pp.203-212.

Pierson, C. (1998), The New Governance of Education: The Conservatives and Education 1988-1997. *Oxford Review of Education.* **24**(1), pp.131-142.

Polkinghorne, D.E. (1988), in Sandelowski, M. (1991), Telling Stories: Narrative Approaches in Qualitative Research. *Journal of Nursing Scholarship.* **23**(3), pp.161-166.

Pollard, A., Broadfoot, P., Croll, P., Osborn, M. and Abbott, D. (1994), Harnett, P. and Vinney, M. (2008) *Understanding Primary Education. Developing professional attributes, knowledge and skills.* Oxon: Routledge. pp.120-138.

Poulson, L. (1998), Accountability, teacher professionalism and education reform in England. *Teacher Development.* **2**(3), pp.419-432.

Q Listserv (2009-2010), Q Listserv [online] Q-METHOD@LISTSERV.KENT.EDU. [accessed 17th September 2013].

Quick, J.C. and Quick, J.D. (1984), in Brown, M., Ralph, S. and Brember, I. (2002) Change-linked work related stress in British teachers. *Research in Education- Manchester*. **67**(-), pp.1-12.

Quicke, J. (1988), The 'New Right' and Education. *British Journal of Education Studies.* **36**(1), pp.5-20.

Reynolds, M. (2001), Education for Inclusion, Teacher education and the Teacher Training Agency Standards. *Professional Development in Education*. **27**(3), pp.465-476

Robson, C. (2002), *Real World Research.* [2nd ed.]. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd.

Rustemier, S. (2002), *Social and educational justice: the human rights framework for inclusion.* Bristol: Centre for Studies on Inclusive Education.

Rutty, J. (1998), in Stronach, I,. Corbin, B., McNamara, O., Stark, S. and Warne, T. (2002) Towards an uncertain politics of professionalism: teacher and nurse identities in flux. *Journal of Education Policy.* **17**(1), pp.109-138.

Ryle, A. (1975), *Frames and Cages: The Repertory Grid Approach to Human Understanding.* Brighton: Sussex University Press.

Sachs, J. (2001), Teacher professional identity: competing discourses, competing outcomes. *Journal of Education Policy.* **16**(2), pp.149-161.

Sainsbury, M. (1996), *SATs the inside story. The development of the first national assessment of seven-year-olds.* Berkshire: National Federation for Educational Research.

Salter, B. and Tapper, E.R. (1988), The Politics of Reversing the Ratchet in Secondary Education 1969-1986. *Journal of Educational Administration.* **20**(2), pp.57-70.

Sandberg, J. (2005), How Do We Justify Knowledge Produced Within Interpretive Approaches? *Organizational Research Methods.* **8**(1), pp.41-68.

Sandelowski, M. (1991), in Sandelowski, M. (2007) Telling Stories: Narrative Approaches in Qualitative Research. *Journal of Nursing Scholarship.* **23**(3), pp.161-166.

Sandelowski, M. (2007), Telling Stories: Narrative Approaches in Qualitative Research. *Journal of Nursing Scholarship.* **23**(3), pp.161-166.

Schostak, J. (2002), *Understanding, Designing and Conducting Qualitative Research in Education.* Buckingham: Open University Press.

Seldon, A. (1997), in, Chitty, C. (2002), *Understanding Schools and Schooling.* London: RoutledgeFalmer, p.40.

Shinebourne, P. (2009), Using Q Method in Qualitative Research. *International Journal of Qualitative Research Methods.* **8**(1), pp.94-97.

Sikes, P. (2006), in Sikes, P. Lawson, H. and Parker, M. (2007) Voices on: teachers and teaching assistants talk about inclusion. *International Journal of Inclusive Education,* **11**(3), pp.355-370.

Sikes, P., Lawson, H. and Parker, M. (2007), Voices on: teachers and teaching assistants talk about inclusion. *International Journal of Inclusive Education,* **11**(3), pp.355-370.

Simon, B. (1985), in, Chitty, C. (1989) *Towards a New Education System. The Victory of the New Right.* Sussex: The Falmer Press. p.29.

Slee, R. (1997), Imported or Important Theory? Sociological interrogations of disablement and special education. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*. **18**(3), pp.407-419.

Slee, R. (2001), 'Inclusion in Practice': does practice make perfect. *Educational Review.* **53**(2), pp.113-123.

Stainton-Rogers, W. (1991), in Brown, S. (1991/1992). *A Q Methodological tutorial.* [online] http://facstaff.uww.edu/cottlec/QArchive/Primer1.html [accessed 20th September 2009].

Stainton-Rogers, W. and Kitzinger, C. (1995), in Kitzinger, C. (1999), Researching subjectivity and diversity. Q-Methodology in Feminist Psychology. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, **23**(-), pp.267-276.

Stainton-Rogers, R. and Stainton-Rogers, W. (1990), *The Electronic journal of Communication.* **1**(1), pp.-.

Stenner, P., Dancey, C. and Watts, S. (2000), The understanding of their illness amongst people with irritable bowel syndrome: a Q methodological study. *Social Science and Medicine.* **51**(-), pp.439-452.

Stephenson, W. (1935), in Brown, S. (1995), *Q Methodology as a Foundation for a Science of Subjectivity.* [online] http://facstaff.uww.edu/cottlec/QArchive/qindex.htm. [accessed 25th September 2009].

Stephenson, W. (1972), in Kitzinger, C. (1999) Researching subjectivity and diversity. Q-Methodology in Feminist Psychology. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, **23**(-), pp.267-276.

Stephenson, W. (1976), in Goldman, I. (1999) Q methodology as Process and Context in Interpretivism, Communication and Psychoanalytic Psychotherapy Research. *The Psychological Record.* **49**(-), pp589-604

Stobart, G. (2001), The validity of National Curriculum Assessment. *British Journal of Educational Studies.* **49**(1), pp.26-39.

Stoll, L. (1999), Realising or potential: understanding and developing capacity for lasting improvement. *School effectiveness and school improvement.* **10**(4), pp.503-532.

Strain, M. and Simkins, T. (2008), Continuity, Change and Educational Reform- Questioning the Legacy of the Education Reform Act 1988. *Educational Management Administration and Leadership.* **36**(2), pp.155-163.

Strauss, A. and Corbin, J. (1990), in Brown, S. (1991/1992). *A Q Methodological tutorial.* [online] http://facstaff.uww.edu/cottlec/QArchive/Primer1.html [accessed 20th September 2009].

Stronach, I., Corbin, B., McNamara, O., Stark, S. and Warne, T. (2002), Towards an uncertain politics of professionalism: teacher and nurse identities in flux. *Journal of Education Policy.* **17**(1), pp.109-138.

Swann, J. and Brown, S. (1997), The implementation of a National Curriculum and Teaching Classroom Thinking. *Research Papers in Education.* **12**(1), pp.91-114.

Tavris, C. and Aronson, E. (2007), *Mistakes were made (but not by me).* London: Pinter and Martin Ltd.

Thatcher, M. (1992), in, Chitty, C. (2009), *Education Policy in Britain.* Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan. pp.54-55.

Thomas, G. and Vaughan, M. (2004), *Inclusive Education: readings and reflections.* Maidenhead: Open University.

Tomlinson, S. (2005), *Education in a post-welfare society.* Maidenhead: Open University.

UNESCO. (1994), in Nutbrown, C. and Clough, P. (2006), *Inclusion in the Early Years.* London: Sage Publications. p.26.

Vaughan, M. (2002), Milestones on the road to inclusion 1970-2002. [online] *Inclusion week.* http://inclusion.uwe.ac.uk/inclusionweek/articles/milestones.htm [accessed 3rd November 2009].

Waller, W. (1932), *The sociology of teaching.* US: John-Wiley and Sons Inc.

Watkins, P. (1993), in, Chitty, C. and Simon, B. (1993) *Education Answers Back: Critical Responses to Government Policy.* London: Lawrence and Wishart, p..70-84.

Watts, S. and Stenner, P. (2005), Doing Q methodology: theory, method and interpretation. *Qualitative Research in Psychology.* **2**(-), pp.67-91.

Webb, R., Vulliamy, G., Hamalainen, S., Sarja, A., Kimonen, E. and Nevalainen, R. (2004), A comparative analysis of primary teacher professionalism in England and Finland. *Comparative Education.* **40**(1), pp.83-107.

Webler, T., Danielson, S., Tuler, S. (2009), *Using Q method to reveal social perspectives in environmental research.* [online] http://seri-us.org/sites/default/files/Qprimer.pdf. [accessed 14th July 2011].

West, A., Sammons, P., Hailes, J. and Nuttall, D. (1997), The Standard Assessment Tasks and the boycott at Key Stage 1: teachers' and headteachers' views in six inner-city schools. *Research Papers in Education.* **9**(3), pp.321-337.

Whitty, G. (2000), Teacher professionalism in new times. *Professional Development in Education.* 26**(2),** pp.281-295.

Whitty, G. (2002), *Making Sense of Education Policy.* London: Paul Chapman Publishing.

Whitty, G. (2008), Twenty years of progress? *Educational Management Administration and Leadership.* Journal of In-Service Education, **26**(2), pp.281-295

Wilkinson, J. (2008), in Gunter, H. (2008) Policy and Workforce Reform in England. *Educational Management Administration and Leadership.* **36**(2), pp.253-270.

Willan, P. (1998), Whatever happened to entitlement in the National Curriculum? *The Curriculum Journal*. **9**(3), pp.269-283.

Winter, E. (2006), Preparing new teachers for inclusive schools and classrooms. *Support for Learning.* **21**(2),pp.85-91.

Wyse, D. and Torrance, H. (2009), The Development and Consequences of National Curriculum Assessment for Primary Education in England. *Educational Research.* **51**(1), pp.213-228.

Yarker, P. (2006), A Kind of Twilight: how do teachers of English at Key Stage 3 respond to the requirement to prepare their students for SATS? *FORUM,* **48**(3), pp.247-255.

Yates, S. (2004), *Doing social science research*. London: SAGE.

Young, M. (1989), in Gunter, H. (2008) Policy and Workforce Reform in England. *Educational Management Administration and Leadership.* **36**(2), pp.253-270.

Appendix one

Consent form

PhD student: Zeta Brown
University of Wolverhampton

This research focuses on teachers' positions on government initiatives, in order to ascertain if the objectives outlined by the government are practically possible. As a participant of this research your input will remain confidential, as the findings are collectively compared and contrasted, with no mention of any information that could be directly tracked back either by participant or school. Additionally, you have the right to withdraw from this research at any point and you will have an opportunity to review your findings within the second phase of the research. If you have any questions prior to, during or after the Q-method then please don't hesitate to speak to me or email me at zeta.brown@wlv.ac.uk.

I am happy to take part in this research:

I have read and understood the information that has been provided to me
I am aware that the findings of this study will be published within the public domain. However, my identity will remain confidential.
I understand that I can withdraw from this research at any point prior to publication.

Appendix two

List of Q-statements

(1) I feel that the government's legislation provides me with good guidelines for this initiative

(2) I believe that there is a continuing reduction in children who are excluded from obtaining the objectives of this initiative

(3) I believe that this initiative focuses on children with special educational needs

(4) I believe that this initiative focuses upon disadvantaged children

(5) I think that all children are considered within this initiative

(6) I feel that the language used within this initiative positively benefits all of my class

(7) Statutory assessment tests are worthwhile for every child

(8) I believe that the statementing process helps children with special educational needs within this initiative

(9) Inclusion within the context of this initiative focuses upon the placement of children into mainstream schools

(10) I do not believe that every child within this initiative can be fully included

(11) I think that the education of children with special educational needs suffers within this initiative

(12) I believe that children with special educational needs hinder the education of the rest of the class

(13) I don't have enough resources to include children with special educational needs

(14) I believe that children with special educational needs can be fully included within every aspect of the schooling experience

(15) I believe in the ideological concept of this initiative but do not feel that it can be fully implemented practically

(16) I feel that within this initiative the school system adapts to accommodate children with special educational needs

(17) I feel that the responsibility of this initiative should be placed on the government

(18) Children with mild special educational needs find it easier to be included within this initiative than those with more severe special educational needs

(19) The school environment is not adequate for the fulfilment of this initiative

(20) There is a lack of support from the local authority to implement this initiative

(21) There is a lack of support from the school to support me in implementing this initiative

(22) There is enough funding within the school to implement this initiative

(23) I need more allocated time to implement this initiative effectively

(24) I believe that I have adequate training in order to effectively implement this initiative to its full potential

(25) Children with special educational needs are seen as needing a specialist education within this initiative

(26) I feel pressure to try and fulfil this initiative

(27) I feel torn between my personal and professional opinion of this initiative

(28) I feel a moral obligation to fulfil the objectives of this initiative

(29) I feel under-acknowledged by the government within this initiative

(30) My position on this initiative is influenced by my experience

(31) My position on this initiative is influenced by the government's objectives

(32) I feel that I am part of the process within implementation of this initiative and therefore I am responsible for its success

(33) The p-scale system is of benefit for children with special educational needs

(34) I feel that there is too much flexibility within the initiative

(35) In my opinion to be a 'good teacher' the most important aspect of my job is achieving in the league tables

(36) In the government's opinion to be a 'good teacher' is to achieve in the league tables

(37) I have to focus my attention on the majority of the class

(38) I feel solely responsible for my classes' successes and failures

(39) I feel that I have little choice with how I implement this initiative

(40) I suffer occupational stress due to the conflicts within this initiative

(41) I feel that I have obtained enough practical experience to achieve the objectives of this initiative

(42) More emphasis is placed upon the statutory assessment tests than any other objective

(43) I should focus more attention on the children who could achieve the ‘national average’

(44) My position on this initiative has changed through practical experience

(45) It is necessary for the school to be accountable to external inspection and the assessment process

(46) I believe that if all my class do not achieve the ‘national average’ they are failing in their education

(47) It is of paramount importance that children achieve academically

(48) There is a need to categorise children according to their gender, racial background and if they have a special educational need to ascertain their educational need

Appendix Three

Example of distribution grid

Appendix Four

Example of report sheet

Appendix Five

Interview schedule

Provide the participant with the factor statements for the inclusion agenda

Which one do you think best represents your position?

[Discussion on response]

[1] Do you believe in the statementing process?
[2] Do you believe that the terminology used for children with SEN benefits children with SEN?
[3] What do you think of the p-scale system?
[4] Do you think children with SEN need a specialist education?
[5] If you feel it would be necessary, what would you change to increase inclusion in your classroom?

Provide the participant with the factor statements for the standards agenda

Which one do you think best represents your position?

[Discussion on response]

[6] What is your position of the EYFS/National Curriculum?
[7] Do you believe the EYFS/National Curriculum and the assessment process focus on the whole child or the whole class?
[8] Do you believe in accountability?
[9] What is your position of SATs and league tables?

[10] Do you feel that your identity as a teacher is positive within society, or do you feel that you would like to see it change?

[11] Do you feel that the inclusion and standards agendas could be implemented at the same time?

Appendix six

Teachers who participated in the post Q-sort semi-structured interviews were as follows:

Claire; nursery; Low SES; 13 years experience
Diane; reception; Low SES; 10 years experience
Doreen; Y3 to 6; High SES; 30 years experience
Greg; Y4; High SES; 15 years experience
Louise; Y4; Low SES; 2 years experience
Nisha; Y3 to 2; Low SES; 4 years experience
Rachel; reception; Low SES; 5 years experience
Susan; Y5; Low SES; 23 years experience

Example of transcript – participant 6

Diane; Y reception; Low SES; 10 years experience

Z- Which one do you think best represents your position?

P: um, probably that one

Z- Oh that really interesting, you actually your position came within factor one so it came within this one. Which part of factor two did you feel

P: I think you do feel pressured to be a 'good teacher' especially with the new OfSTED framework, like when their coming into schools and obviously being quite harsh and looking more at lesson observations, they're going to pick up individual children that are perhaps not catered for or you know if you see any children on the edge of learning, like special needs children, who are included in education, you obviously have to deal with all these children as well and with our year group at the moment we have a lot of special needs within the group, I

think its about 11 on IEP's so were obviously dealing with all of those children as well and then weve got the opposite end of the spectrum with three really bright ones. So we have got six or seven different groups and four members of staff so its kind of pulling you all different ways trying to fit all of these different groups in and still build up the good outstanding teacher that you strive to be for every child.

Z: That absolutely makes sense, um factor ones statement really showed the dominance of the standards agenda and sort of the objectives you have to meet and that kind of came out even more than the inclusion agenda. So it was really interesting in that respect because it sort of showed the objectives you have to meet and that really then practically everything comes within that, which is really interesting, um, Do you feel that children with special educational needs can be included within these objectives?

P: I do, I mean that the problem we have in reception is there is nothing for us, so early years, I think its called early years service stops at the end of nursery, so in nursery they have a lot of support with special needs, they get lots of outside help coming in and then suddenly they come into reception if they haven't got a statement but they still have a need there is nothing for them until they move into year one. So we are kind of the year that is left to drift, so although we have some special needs that do, might need statementing we can't start that process until year one. I think it's a wasted year for them, I think it's a gap year really where they could be picked up earlier if there was something for them, but there is nothing because it doesn't start until their in year one.

Z: and what kind of services are they?

P: Early years, ** will know in nursery I think its early years epcialist, I can't think what the name is

Z: But its sort of all of the specialist provisions that can be put in place?

P: Ye, but its only classed up until the end of nursery, but were still early years but obviously the outside services can't do anything until they're in year one.

Z: Wow

P: I think it's a big gap year and I think it's a year to address needs early but you can't because no-one can do anything for them

Z: and do you feel torn between what you personally would like to do and what you professionally need to do, you know do you feel like

P: Ye, I think perhaps a younger teacher coming into they might think more like that, but as an older more established teacher I think you use your own professional judgement and you know whats right for the children so you do get the balance more, rather than doing everything by the book in a way, when you're a bit older you realise actually I need to do this and this is for the good of the children. In this particular year group they're a young, working on particular developmental stages and we have taken it right back and we haven't felt the rush to get on with it with sounds and phonics. But we have done a lot of phase one phonic work and work with what they need really rather than were they are expected to be. Because unless they have got those early skills grounded there is no point moving on (5:10). So we have had to make again the professional decision to say no, they need to work more like a nursery even though they are reception and hopefully that will pay off with the children when they make their development.

Z: That definitely makes sense, obviously from what you have said you believe the statementing process is beneficial but it doesn't come in quick enough.

P: Theres nothing for them, it stops at the end of nursery. Last year we had a little boy that was desperate for it you know, but there was no-one to come in and help him.

Z: So that's a whole year waiting, Oh goodness. Do you believe that children with special educational needs need a specialist education, that's sort of in comparison to their peers?

P: I think it depends on the educational need really (06:01) if its behavioural obviously, you might be able to cater for that within the classroom, if its more multi-sensory then you know, then maybe they do. Obviously with our early years foundation stage we can go back to 0-12 months and sort of cater for them in that way, with the developmental stages but I know as they move through the school, it probably is more difficult (06:26). And we find in reception

class if you have got a child with special educational needs its less noticeable but when the other children start to mature and grow and then grow up that's when it becomes more noticeable, as they move through the school its more obvious. They probably feel more isolated from the group

Z: That makes sense definitely, do you believe the language used to define children with special educational needs is beneficial

P: (06:53) I think sometimes labelling them as that is given them that sigma and you know, they know anyway I think and a lot of the children whether they have got a difficulty or a need or group their in their quite aware of that. So I think the language is no, its not very helpful to them.

Z: That definitely makes sense, um, do you feel that the standards agenda so the things that you have to do for the EYFS and any kind of the assessment process, do you feel that encourages you to focus on the whole child or the whole class?

P: Imp, here we do very individualised learning, so you will notice that we have picked up a certain thing and we plan for it the next day, we have got the freedom to do that so we can do individuals, but obviously we look at the whole cohort if there is a specific problem and then we teach that. But we do teach in quite small groups, because of the staff we are quite lucky, so and we do a lot of gap building with the children, so we make sure their little gaps are picked up before they move on, but I don't know whether they do that in other schools, but they are quite good at that here.

Z: That makes sense, and if you could of only if you feel you need to would you change anything in your classroom to increase inclusion?

P: Um, the support, getting the support I think, so you have got people coming into help you, how to deal with a specific problem, we have got a lot of behavioural problems this year so we have had someone from the MERE, which is a behavioural group come in and work with about 10 children, that's been quite beneficial for that group of children, because you don't always have time your torn trying to get this done and that done to a certain standard so things like behavioural groups and nurture groups you don't always have time to do. I know

its been a help having like an outside agency come in with them and do a bit of extra, you would like to do if you have the time, but you don't always have the time to do it

Z: If you could have a look at them, they are for the standards agenda?

P: I agree with both of them really, parts of them. (10:02) I don't always agree with the standards agenda I think that its not beneficial to the children to be labelled so early really, as achieving or under-achieving, um for a lot of young children it takes some extra time it not always stopping at the end of reception class, they need to carry on with the EYFS to make their progress, especially a lot of the younger children, you know and if they're not reaching that 6 on the profile then they are seen as below average and for a lot of them developmentally they are just not ready for it. They need to take it in their own time

Z: Really the difference between the main one, is that factor one the teachers' felt that they are more constrained by the objectives, where factor two felt that there was a bit more flexibility within there. Which one do you feel you fell on more than the other?

P: Um, probably factor two now, I would say if you are an NQT you would probably feel constrained by again like a said before (10:58) now you use you own professional judgement

Z: That's really interesting, you came out on factor one but as I'm talking to teachers about it they are saying the same kind of things that actually yes there is constraints there professionally there is things.

P: Ye, I think it depends on the cohort of children as well, because (11:18) you ask me that last year with last year's cohort who were quite a bright cohort, whereas this year they are not so bright, so my opinion may be different because I have had to change and not restrict myself of thinking of that profile because a lot of them won't be storing on there, where they should be really so we have had to take it back for the needs of the children*

Z: It really makes sense, Do you feel, we have already gone through that one, sorry. Um, and that one. And that one, were going through them quick.. Ye, so do you believe in accountability, do you believe in the assessment of children but not necessarily the way that its done

P: I do I think that obviously it is a teachers responsibility to ensure that all children make progress and that has to be measured in some way (12:06) but I don't obviously, well especially for the foundation stage profile I don't think that a lot of those profile points are relevant to the children or to the education that we give, I don't also think, things like the writing and the reading section are particularly high, they are hard to achieve and they don't match then to the new letters and sounds profile that we have had. It doesn't seem to tie in, I think it needs to be modified more to the needs of the children. Its just its off in places I think and its not reliable, it isn't what I would assess them on by the end of reception, but you are constrained to assess them to that, but I don't always think the scale points are relevant. (12:35).

Z: o you feel that the guidelines from the EYFS helps you on a day to day basis, or do you feel that because of these set targets that they causes more difficulties

P: I think you know the profile you know where the children need to be so in a way they are always at the back of your mind when you are planning and delivering and I do think sometimes the EYFS guidance its too vast (13:14) there's too much of it there and that's hard to ensure that you cover all of that, so and your looking for objectives that your covering, some of them are so wholly and vague its not clear, you know its just not clear and again as a teacher you know where they should be you know what they should be doing, you don't always have to follow that by the book to know that you are delivering everything that they need. (13.35).

Z: and do you feel that the identity as a teacher should be seen differently than the way it is? When it comes to the accountability side

P: (13:44) I think people should put more faith in you, your professional judgements and trust you a little bit more because you do know where they are at and what you need to do with them. I think if you are a conscientious teacher you do want them all to make progress and you do want to think okay them lets look at where they went out on and be proud of your achievements, without always having to measure it and justify so and so didn't get here or so and so didn't get there * and I think that a lot of it these days is Ofsted that seems to be more pressured (14:14) forming the more pressure because its more value added where they come

in and where they go out on all the points they have achieved, how many points progress and sometimes not looking at what the actual children need. So if you have a particularly poor cohort they need you as a mother really (10:31), moral guidance to give them all of that so its not always academic that they should be judging, it should be the whole child, and where they have made progress in their personal and emotional development, but I still think that you know Ofsted and you know schools really still really put high emphasis on literacy and numeracy more than anything else*

Z: Yes absolutely, do you believe that the inclusion agenda is considered within the standards agenda? S do you believe that including all children is considered within the

P: Um, I don't (15:09) think so, as like I said before I don't think the foundation stage profile that they are assessed on, the lower ability children it doesn't always match because them of them don't always score on them so it looks like they have achieved nothing at the end of reception class. Because yes they have all of the earlier developmental points but they are not measured at the end of reception its just that nine scale points. So they could have come into reception working at 0-12 months and gone out at 36 months but it still is not scoring on the profile * and that's not measured anywhere

Z: Do you feel when you are implementing the inclusion and standards agenda together, because that's what my in effect what my doctorate is about the implementation of them together, do you feel that it is possible to do them both at the same time?

P: um, I think that the scale point(14:04), the profile points, not the profile points I'm confused by all the points! The EYFS document with all of the developmental stages are covered in theory because obviously its catering for different children and different educational needs, for children working below that's good to plan for them but I think the foundation stage profile doesn't fit into the inclusion agenda because its not going low enough for all of the children (14:25) and it doesn't measure their progress even though they good have made big steps, if they are not scoring six on the profile they are seen as failing. Whereas if it was measuring right the way back and you could see how far they have actually come in that year, they have made a few, they have made some steps of progress but I don't think they tie in.

Z: With the coalition government coming in do you think that has made any difference?

P: No, I know that they are (17:07) changing the foundation stage profile to cut it down a bit, less points, but it doesn't look any easier to me. It looks like they have condensed about five points into one

Z: Right so its still there but it looks like its, ye

P: and I still think they need more actual practical teachers (17.23) working on these documents, rather than other so called professionals, we need actual classroom teachers that are in it to say what is working what needs to be done and I don't think they take it into account, teachers' views enough.

Appendix Seven- Factor analysis data

Factor analysis data for the inclusion agenda

SORTS	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26
1 Claire	100	60	26	42	27	34	-5	30	29	-14	25	25	34	7	19	29	17	24	17	22	25	6	-3	23	23	3
2 Rachel	60	100	45	49	42	53	30	48	50	11	37	27	42	19	46	44	37	36	25	32	25	12	16	56	20	52
3 Mia	26	45	100	52	60	65	56	54	58	8	35	37	19	45	70	37	10	42	19	19	34	28	24	44	31	44
4 Susan	42	49	52	100	69	60	44	43	39	4	22	35	25	48	48	48	17	46	20	33	42	31	22	40	43	57
5 Rita	27	42	60	69	100	56	42	38	46	20	17	42	27	50	49	46	27	65	42	29	27	19	33	61	30	35
6 Diane	34	53	65	60	56	100	53	59	69	23	54	40	27	37	48	34	23	29	41	39	43	36	16	49	28	53
7 Helena	-5	30	56	44	42	53	100	57	47	25	29	8	11	48	58	47	4	21	4	16	35	19	20	33	32	39
8 Charlotte	30	48	54	43	38	59	57	100	60	18	40	19	2	47	64	36	17	21	8	42	52	14	27	37	44	60
9 Victoria	29	50	58	39	46	69	47	60	100	26	52	29	36	28	60	31	31	27	45	47	46	23	32	40	19	39
10 Faye	14	11	8	4	20	23	25	18	26	100	-2	-8	-12	12	11	19	15	13	15	33	39	3	10	28	14	25
11 Nisha	25	37	35	22	17	54	29	40	52	-2	100	23	41	-2	27	-4	8	11	11	19	17	13	29	33	-6	34
12 Tina	25	27	37	35	42	40	8	19	29	-8	23	100	37	10	16	23	15	34	24	11	11	17	25	44	10	13
13 Louise	34	42	19	25	27	27	11	2	36	-12	41	37	100	-8	6	19	35	28	34	-6	7	24	21	22	-29	3
14 Elizabeth	7	19	45	48	50	37	48	47	28	12	-2	10	-8	100	61	34	42	27	16	27	43	25	18	45	47	31
15 Lily	19	46	70	48	49	48	58	64	60	11	27	16	6	61	100	41	22	42	9	11	50	17	22	44	29	31
16 Hayley	29	44	37	48	46	34	47	36	31	19	-4	23	19	34	41	100	31	37	17	21	37	32	8	31	25	29
17 Ruth	17	37	10	17	27	23	4	17	31	15	8	15	35	42	22	31	100	29	28	17	25	43	22	44	11	0
18 Caitlin	24	36	42	46	65	29	21	21	27	13	11	34	28	27	42	37	29	100	30	13	25	-1	17	37	25	19
19 Jacky	17	25	19	20	42	41	4	8	45	15	11	24	34	16	9	17	28	30	100	37	3	4	5	30	1	24
20 Graham	22	32	19	33	29	39	16	42	47	33	19	11	-6	27	11	21	17	13	37	100	36	11	23	44	49	54
21 Edith	25	25	34	42	27	43	35	52	46	39	17	11	7	43	50	37	25	25	3	36	100	23	22	37	25	47
22 Molly	6	12	28	31	19	36	19	14	23	3	13	17	24	25	17	32	43	-1	4	11	23	100	4	29	-3	11
23 Lola	-3	16	24	22	33	16	20	27	32	10	29	25	21	18	22	8	22	17	5	23	22	4	100	33	5	6
24 Doreen	23	56	44	40	61	49	33	37	40	28	33	44	22	45	44	31	44	37	30	44	37	29	33	100	29	37
25 Greg	23	20	31	43	30	28	32	44	19	14	-6	10	-29	47	29	25	11	25	1	49	25	-3	5	29	100	41
26Christoph	35	52	44	57	35	53	39	60	39	25	34	13	3	31	31	29	0	19	24	54	47	11	6	37	41	100

Unrotated Factor Matrix

	Factors		
	1	2	3
SORTS			
1 Claire	0.4090	0.1457	0.1327
2 Rachel	0.6828	0.1668	0.2309
3 Mia	0.7213	-0.0300	0.1887
4 Susan	0.7341	-0.0519	-0.0346
5 Rita	0.7482	0.0644	-0.2838
6 Diane	0.8062	0.0342	0.1842
7 Helena	0.5738	-0.3727	0.1794
8 Charlotte	0.6993	-0.3291	0.3031
9 Victoria	0.7572	0.0692	0.2284

10 Faye	0.2430	-0.1733	-0.1818
11 Nisha	0.4123	0.2846	0.5495
12 Tina	0.4150	0.3809	-0.0735
13 Louise	0.3222	0.7673	0.1299
14 Elizabeth	0.5608	-0.3405	-0.2634
15 Lily	0.6729	-0.2198	0.1407
16 Hayley	0.5561	-0.0893	-0.1164
17 Ruth	0.4172	0.2770	-0.3883
18 Caitlin	0.5151	0.0708	-0.1969
19 Jacky	0.3701	0.3095	-0.0893
20 Graham	0.4990	-0.0831	-0.1634
21 Edith	0.5767	-0.3020	-0.0105
22 Molly	0.3216	0.0273	-0.0465
23 Lola	0.3342	0.0721	-0.0600
24 Doreen	0.7098	0.1376	-0.2667
25 Greg	0.3989	-0.4868	-0.1496
26 Christopher	0.6086	-0.2926	0.1411
Eigenvalues	8.2818	1.9502	1.2019
% expl.Var.	32	8	5

Factor Matrix with an X Indicating a Defining Sort

Loadings

QSORT	1	2	3
1 Claire	0.3604X	0.2581	0.0979
2 Rachel	0.5979X	0.3771	0.2184
3 Mia	0.5558X	0.2946	0.4013
4 Susan	0.3785	0.4027	0.4871
5 Rita	0.2016	0.6135X	0.4769
6 Diane	0.6097X	0.3864	0.4049
7 Helena	0.4137	-0.0043	0.5738X
8 Charlotte	0.5914X	0.0314	0.5817
9 Victoria	0.6232X	0.3581	0.3371
10 Faye	-0.0364	0.1209	0.3259X
11 Nisha	0.7214X	0.1346	-0.1199

12 Tina	0.2317	0.5184X	-0.0185
13 Louise	0.4023	0.6085X	-0.4211
14 Elizabeth	0.0517	0.2367	0.6641X
15 Lily	0.4611	0.1701	0.5286X
16 Hayley	0.2060	0.3194	0.4316X
17 Ruth	-0.0382	0.6150X	0.1480
18 Caitlin	0.1416	0.4401X	0.3088
19 Jacky	0.1828	0.4551X	0.0128
20 Graham	0.1366	0.3150	0.4059X
21 Edith	0.2717	0.1403	0.5748X
22 Molly	0.1479	0.2246	0.1844
23 Lola	0.1508	0.2675	0.1619
24 Doreen	0.2048	0.6298X	0.3941
25 Greg	0.0308	-0.0078	0.6461X
26 Christopher	0.4142	0.0865	0.5448X
% expl.Var.	14	13	17

Factor Q-Sort Values for Each Statement

			Factor Arrays		
No.	Statement	No.	1	2	3
1	1 I feel that the government's legislation provides me with g	1	-2	-1	-2
2	2 I believe that there is a continuing reductiohn in children	2	-1	2	-1
3	3 I believe that this initiative focuses on children with se	3	2	2	2
4	4 I believe that this initiative focuses upon disadvantaged	4	0	1	0
5	5 I think that ALL children are considered within this inita	5	-1	0	-4
6	6 I feel that the language used within this initiative posit	6	-1	1	-2
7	7 Statutory assessment tests are worthwhile for every child	7	-4	-4	-2
8	8 I believe that the statementing process helps children wit	8	3	2	2
9	9 Inclusion within the context of this initiative focuses up	9	2	3	2
10	10 I do not believe that every child within this initiative	10	1	0	5
11	11 I think that the education of children with sen suffers w	11	1	-1	1
12	12 I believe that children with special educational needs hi	12	-2	-2	4
13	13 I don't have enough resources to include children with s	13	3	-1	1
14	14 I believe that children with special educational needs ca	14	-2	-2	-4
15	15 I believe in the ideological concept of this initiative b	15	3	4	3
16	16 I feel that within this initiative the school system adap	16	-2	1	1

17	17 I feel that the responsibility of this initiative should	17	2	1	0
18	18 Children with mild sen find it easier to be included wit	18	2	5	3
19	19 The school environment is not adequate for the fulfilment	19	2	-1	1
20	20 There is a lack of support from the LA to implement this	20	4	0	0
21	21 There is a lack of support from the school to support me	21	0	-2	-2
22	22 There is enough funding within the school to implement t	22	-3	-4	-1
23	23 I need more allocated time to implement this initiative e	23	3	2	2
24	24 I believe that I have adequate training in order to effe	24	-3	0	-3
25	25 Children with sen are seen as needing a specialist educat	25	1	0	0
26	26 I feel pressure to try and fulfil this initiative	26	0	3	0
27	27 I feel torn between my person and professional opinion o	27	0	0	-1
28	28 I feel a moral obligation to fulfil the objectives of t	28	1	3	-2
29	29 I feel under-acknowledged by the government within this i	29	1	-1	1
30	30 My position on this initiative is influenced by my experi	30	2	3	0
31	31 My position on this initiative is influenced by the Gover	31	-1	-2	-2
32	32 I feel that I am part of the process within implementation	32	1	2	-1
33	33 The p-scale system is of benefit for children with sen	33	-1	1	3
34	34 I feel that there is too much flexibility within this in	34	0	-2	-1
35	35 In my opinion to be a 'good teacher' the most important	35	-5	-5	-5
36	36 In the government's opinion to be a ;'good teacher' is to	36	4	4	4
37	37 I have to focus my attention on the majority of the class	37	0	0	3
38	38 I feel solely responsible for my classes' successes and f	38	-1	2	2
39	39 I feel that I have little choice with how I implement thi	39	0	-1	-1
40	40 I suffer occupational stress due to the conflicts within t	40	-1	1	0
41	41 I feel that I have obtained enough practical experience to	41	-2	0	0
42	42 More emphasis is placed upon the sat's than any other obj	42	5	-3	1
43	43 I should focus more attention on the children who could	43	-3	-3	1
44	44 My position on this initiative has changed through practi	44	1	1	-1
45	45 It is necessary for the school to be accountable to exter	45	0	-1	2
46	46 I believe that if all my class do not achieve the 'nation	46	-4	-3	-3
47	47 It is of paramount importance that children achieve acade	47	-3	-3	-3
48	48 There is a need to catergorise children according to thei	48	-2	-2	-3

Factor analysis data for the standards agenda

Correlation Matrix Between Sorts

SORTS	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25
1 Claire	100	60	5	8	7	34	10	4	11	18	18	20	15	-4	6	35	9	39	24	29	12	26	19	19	10
2 Rachel	60	100	-7	5	15	41	17	8	21	21	21	12	12	-25	14	18	2	24	19	8	-3	36	33	42	29
3 Mia	5	-7	100	56	54	47	55	45	14	32	32	45	42	48	46	8	5	38	17	68	33	17	58	39	29
4 Susan	8	5	56	100	65	65	45	48	12	57	57	61	45	55	57	33	32	41	12	65	59	30	62	44	48
5 Rita	7	15	54	65	100	62	32	58	26	37	37	61	39	37	50	-2	3	35	29	44	50	33	55	34	37
6 Diane	34	41	47	65	62	100	39	58	25	58	58	63	63	35	54	37	17	42	42	53	52	39	74	39	37
7 Helena	10	17	55	45	32	39	100	38	33	28	28	20	42	31	53	21	20	35	3	44	25	21	54	44	48
8 Charlotte	4	8	45	48	58	58	38	100	35	33	33	50	40	52	40	3	9	52	34	46	41	27	62	32	44
9 Victoria	11	21	14	12	26	25	33	35	100	28	28	8	12	-14	19	0	10	8	23	20	23	33	29	39	27
10 Faye	18	21	32	57	37	58	28	33	28	100	100	52	50	32	32	37	45	25	22	37	31	48	54	37	41
11 Nisha	18	21	32	57	37	58	28	33	28	100	100	52	50	32	32	37	45	25	22	37	31	48	54	37	41
12 Tina	20	12	45	61	61	63	20	50	8	52	52	100	56	49	33	25	4	43	46	56	52	35	56	26	36
13 Louise	15	12	42	45	39	63	42	40	12	50	50	56	100	50	49	38	25	35	41	45	49	28	64	22	35
14 Elizabeth	-4	-25	48	55	37	35	31	52	-14	32	32	49	50	100	47	21	21	30	4	56	37	6	45	6	20
15 Lily	6	14	46	57	50	54	53	40	19	32	32	33	49	47	100	31	32	34	16	45	50	19	44	41	39
16 Hayley	35	18	8	33	-2	37	21	3	0	37	37	25	38	21	31	100	26	20	21	18	37	29	16	21	31
17 Ruth	9	2	5	32	3	17	20	9	10	45	45	4	25	21	32	26	100	23	19	15	14	14	25	25	27
18 Caitlin	39	24	38	41	35	42	35	52	8	25	25	43	35	30	34	20	23	100	29	49	34	28	49	25	27
19 Jacky	24	19	17	12	29	42	3	34	23	22	22	46	41	4	16	21	19	29	100	15	19	40	42	35	32
20 Edith	29	8	68	65	44	53	44	46	20	37	37	56	45	56	45	18	15	49	15	100	35	19	47	27	19
21 Molly	12	-3	33	59	50	52	25	41	23	31	31	52	49	37	50	37	14	34	19	35	100	22	48	18	21
22 Lola	26	36	17	30	33	39	21	27	33	48	48	35	28	6	19	29	14	28	40	19	22	100	41	42	45
23 Doreen	19	33	58	62	55	74	54	62	29	54	54	56	64	45	44	16	25	49	42	47	48	41	100	43	51
24 Greg	19	42	39	44	34	39	44	32	39	37	37	26	22	6	41	21	25	25	35	27	18	42	43	100	55
25 Christoph	10	29	29	48	37	37	48	44	27	41	41	36	35	20	39	31	27	27	32	19	21	45	51	55	100

Unrotated Factor Matrix

	Factors	
	1	2
SORTS		
1 Claire	0.3076	0.2730
2 Rachel	0.3015	0.4394
3 Mia	0.5975	-0.4227
4 Susan	0.7791	-0.2281
5 Rita	0.6536	-0.2899
6 Diane	0.8355	-0.0215
7 Helena	0.5689	-0.0739
8 Charlotte	0.6468	-0.2595
9 Victoria	0.3322	0.1994
10 Faye	0.6962	0.2896
11 Nisha	0.6962	0.2896
12 Tina	0.7005	-0.1608
13 Louise	0.6894	-0.1016

14 Elizabeth	0.4832	-0.5544
15 Lily	0.6419	-0.1728
16 Hayley	0.4003	0.2147
17 Ruth	0.3319	0.2071
18 Caitlin	0.5719	-0.0765
19 Jacky	0.4333	0.1725
20 Edith	0.6511	-0.3358
21 Molly	0.5713	-0.2475
22 Lola	0.5223	0.4125
23 Doreen	0.8276	-0.0797
24 Greg	0.5704	0.3036
25 Christopher	0.6015	0.2160
Eigenvalues	8.8882	1.8504
% expl.Var.	36	7

Factor Matrix with an X Indicating a Defining Sort

	Loadings	
QSORT	1	2
1 Claire	0.0594	0.4070X
2 Rachel	-0.0525	0.5303X
3 Mia	0.7293X	0.0617
4 Susan	0.7428X	0.3275
5 Rita	0.6866X	0.1994
6 Diane	0.6528X	0.5218
7 Helena	0.4827X	0.3100
8 Charlotte	0.6618X	0.2183
9 Victoria	0.1256	0.3666X
10 Faye	0.3458	0.6700X
11 Nisha	0.3458	0.6700X
12 Tina	0.6393X	0.3284
13 Louise	0.5927X	0.3664
14 Elizabeth	0.7267X	-0.1127
15 Lily	0.6022X	0.2815
16 Hayley	0.1678	0.4221X
17 Ruth	0.1204	0.3722X
18 Caitlin	0.4867X	0.3100

19 Jacky	0.2202	0.4111X
20 Edith	0.7143X	0.1627
21 Molly	0.5964X	0.1788
22 Lola	0.1336	0.6520X
23 Doreen	0.6842X	0.4723
24 Greg	0.2406	0.5997X
25 Christopher	0.3208	0.5527X
% expl.Var.	26	17

Factor Q-Sort Values for Each Statement

			Factor Arrays		
No.	Statement		No.	1	2
1	1	I feel that the government's legislation provides me with g	1	-1	-1
2	2	I believe that there is a continuing reduction in children	2	-1	0
3	3	I believe that this initiative focuses on children with se	3	-2	-2
4	4	I believe that this initiative focuses upon disadvantaged c	4	-3	-3
5	5	I think that ALL children are considered within this inita	5	-4	2
6	6	I feel that the language used within this initiative posit	6	-1	-1
7	7	Statutory Assessment Tests are worthwhile for every child	7	-4	-4
8	8	I believe that the statementing process helps children wit	8	1	1
9	9	Inclusion within the context of this initiative focuses up	9	0	-1
10	10	I do not believe that every child within this initiative	10	3	-2
11	11	I think that the education of children with sen suffers w	11	2	-2
12	12	I believe that children with sen hinder the education of	12	-1	-3
13	13	I don't have enough resources to include children with se	13	-2	1
14	14	I believe that children with sen can be fully included wi	14	-3	-1
15	15	I believe in the ideological concept of this initiative b	15	-2	-2
16	16	I feel that within this initiative the school system adap	16	0	0
17	17	I feel that the responsibility of this initiative should	17	0	0
18	18	Children with mild sen find it easier to be included wit	18	2	2
19	19	The school environment is not adequate for the fulfilment	19	-1	0
20	20	There is a lack of support from the LA to implement this	20	-1	1
21	21	There is a lack of support from the school to support me	21	-3	-2
22	22	There is enough funding within the school to implement th	22	0	-2
23	23	I need more allocated time to implement this initiative eff	23	1	4
24	24	I believe that I have adequate training in order to effec	24	1	0

25	25	Children with sen are seen as needing a specialist ed wit	25	0	0
26	26	I feel pressure to try and fulfil this initiative	26	4	4
27	27	I feel torn between my personal and professional opinion	27	2	-1
28	28	I feel a moral obligation to fulfil the objectives of thi	28	1	2
29	29	I feel under-acknowledged by the government within this i	29	2	3
30	30	My position on this initiative is influenced by my experi	30	3	3
31	31	My position on this initiative id influenced by the Gover	31	-2	3
32	32	I feel that I am part of the process within implementatio	32	1	3
33	33	The p-scale system is of benefit for children with sen	33	1	-1
34	34	I feel there is too much flexibility within this initiaiv	34	-2	-3
35	35	In my opinion to be a 'good teacher' the most important a	35	-5	-5
36	36	In the government's opinion to be a 'goodteacher' is to a	36	5	5
37	37	I have to focus my attention on the majority of the class	37	2	1
38	38	I feel solely responsible for my classes' success and fa	38	2	2
39	39	I feel that I have little choice with how I implement thi	39	3	0
40	40	I suffer occupational stress due to the conflicts within	40	3	0
41	41	I feel that I have obtained enough practical experience t	41	1	1
42	42	More emphasis is placed upon the sat's than any other obj	42	4	2
43	43	I should focus more attention on the children who could a	43	0	-3
44	44	My position on this initiative had changed through practi	44	0	1
45	45	It is necessary for the school to be accountable to exter	45	0	2
46	46	I believe that if all my class do not achieve the 'nation	46	-2	-4
47	47	It is of paramount importance that children achieve acade	47	-1	-1
48	48	There is a need to categorise children according to their	48	-3	1

Factor analysis for the combination of the inclusion and standards agenda

Correlation Matrix Between Sorts

SORT	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30
1 Claireinc	100	41	60	52	26	2	28	3	19	28	34	30	-7	3	30	13	29	27	-14	0	25	3	25	22	34	3	7	-36	19	-1
2 Claireinc	4	1	100	27	60	2	5	16	8	23	7	32	34	-8	10	-4	4	14	11	22	34	9	18	23	20	31	15	-10	-4	2	6
3 Rachelinc	60	27	100	42	45	9	35	7	33	35	53	35	26	11	48	34	50	33	11	10	37	26	27	31	42	2	19	-29	46	15
4 Rachelsta	52	60	42	100	4	-7	21	5	15	15	32	41	-9	17	1	8	18	21	-9	9	30	21	28	12	54	12	-23	-25	-1	14
5 Miainc	26	2	45	4	100	47	38	40	52	70	65	41	54	32	54	52	58	52	8	23	35	36	37	42	19	25	45	19	70	32
6 Miasta	2	5	9	-7	47	100	5	56	15	54	48	47	42	55	40	45	28	14	20	27	2	32	28	45	-7	42	32	48	29	46
7 Susaninc	28	16	35	21	38	5	100	35	69	58	48	31	30	33	31	35	27	13	8	16	14	11	29	32	11	11	42	14	36	21
8 Susansta	3	8	7	5	40	56	35	100	31	65	42	65	20	45	46	48	23	12	2	11	20	57	48	61	2	45	31	55	27	57
9 Ritainc	19	23	33	15	52	15	69	31	100	66	48	33	35	23	31	35	38	22	23	33	12	28	39	37	18	10	46	12	42	19
10 Ritasta	28	7	35	15	70	54	58	65	66	100	73	62	43	32	57	58	52	26	11	24	22	37	60	61	16	39	53	37	57	50
11 Dianeinc	34	32	53	32	65	48	48	42	48	73	100	67	47	39	59	59	69	46	23	29	54	38	40	58	27	52	37	25	48	37
12 Dianesta	30	34	35	41	41	47	31	65	33	62	67	100	17	39	38	58	43	25	0	16	31	58	59	63	31	63	15	35	15	54
13 Helenainc	-7	-8	26	-9	54	42	30	20	35	43	47	17	100	50	49	50	41	28	23	16	23	21	12	28	11	28	40	29	54	29
14 Helenasta	3	10	11	17	32	55	33	45	23	32	39	39	50	100	30	38	25	33	9	30	16	28	1	20	-5	42	24	31	34	53
15 Charlotteinc	30	-4	48	1	54	40	31	46	31	57	59	38	49	30	100	76	60	45	18	0	40	33	19	46	2	27	47	29	64	26
16 Charlottesta	13	4	34	8	52	45	35	48	35	58	59	58	50	38	76	100	44	35	15	19	27	33	31	50	-6	40	51	52	52	40
17 Victoriainc	29	14	50	18	58	28	27	23	38	52	69	43	41	25	60	44	100	73	26	27	52	44	29	41	36	36	28	2	60	34

18	Victoriasta	27	11	33	21	52	14	13	12	22	26	46	25	28	33	45	35	73	100	12	22	40	28	7	8	28	12	14	-14	42	19
19	Fayeinc	14	22	11	-9	8	20	8	2	23	11	23	0	23	9	18	15	26	12	100	62	-2	14	-8	0	-12	5	12	12	11	18
20	Fayesta	0	34	10	9	23	27	16	11	33	24	29	16	16	30	0	19	27	22	62	100	-11	6	3	9	-4	23	28	23	23	44
21	Nishainc	25	9	37	30	35	2	14	20	12	22	54	31	23	16	40	27	52	40	-2	-11	100	52	23	35	41	40	-2	-4	27	2
22	Nishasta	3	18	26	21	36	32	11	57	28	37	38	58	21	28	33	33	44	28	14	6	52	100	39	52	32	50	-4	32	15	32
23	Tinaina	25	23	27	28	37	28	29	48	39	60	40	59	12	1	19	31	29	7	-8	3	23	39	100	56	37	29	10	15	16	29
24	Tinasta	22	20	31	12	42	45	32	61	37	61	58	63	28	20	46	50	41	8	0	9	35	52	56	100	19	56	17	49	35	33
25	Louiseinc	34	31	42	54	19	-7	11	2	18	16	27	31	11	-5	2	-6	36	28	-12	-4	41	32	37	19	100	12	-8	-23	6	9
26	Louisesta	3	15	2	12	25	42	11	45	10	39	52	63	28	42	27	40	36	12	5	23	40	50	29	56	12	100	7	50	16	49
27	Elizabethinc	7	-10	19	-23	45	32	42	31	46	53	37	15	40	24	47	51	28	14	12	28	-2	-4	10	17	-8	7	100	35	61	32
28	Elizabethst	-36	-4	-29	-25	19	48	14	55	12	37	25	35	29	31	29	52	2	-14	12	23	-4	32	15	49	-23	50	35	100	20	47
29	Lilyinc	19	2	46	-1	70	29	36	27	42	57	48	15	54	34	64	52	60	42	11	23	27	15	16	35	6	16	61	20	100	35
30	Lilysta	-1	6	15	14	32	46	21	57	19	50	37	54	29	53	26	40	34	19	18	44	2	32	29	33	9	49	32	47	35	100
31	Hayleyinc	29	9	44	-1	37	30	40	22	41	37	34	15	41	25	36	24	31	21	19	17	-4	-5	23	26	19	-1	34	-5	41	18
32	Hayleysta	-3	35	-4	18	-18	8	3	33	-2	-2	10	37	-15	21	-12	3	2	0	4	12	6	37	8	25	25	38	-13	21	-28	31
33	Ruthinc	17	23	37	8	10	-2	11	12	23	17	23	15	2	-12	17	11	31	12	15	22	8	9	15	13	35	-6	42	-3	22	33
34	Ruthsta	-12	9	1	2	2	5	-2	32	5	3	-1	17	4	20	-3	9	-4	10	17	22	12	45	17	4	-4	25	2	21	-1	32
35	Caitlininc	24	34	36	24	42	8	32	26	56	44	29	23	27	20	21	21	27	26	13	24	11	8	34	16	28	-9	27	-18	42	29
36	Caitlinsta	11	39	10	24	28	38	8	41	25	35	34	42	34	35	25	52	15	8	25	34	10	25	33	43	0	35	27	30	29	34
37	Jackyinc	17	23	25	32	19	6	10	8	35	29	41	44	2	5	8	26	45	37	15	33	11	19	24	24	34	28	16	-2	9	24
38	Jackysta	18	24	22	19	15	17	12	12	25	29	44	42	12	3	12	34	43	23	10	22	22	22	45	46	2	41	2	4	4	16
39	Grahaminc	22	4	32	5	19	20	33	30	29	30	39	33	10	26	42	34	47	39	33	17	19	28	11	21	-6	16	27	2	11	25
40	Edithinc	25	27	25	6	34	36	42	33	27	37	43	21	39	44	52	42	46	31	39	30	17	9	11	25	7	26	43	24	50	36
41	Edithsta	4	29	-8	8	31	68	9	65	13	44	44	53	18	44	41	46	25	20	18	23	12	37	32	56	-7	45	11	56	22	45
42	Mollyinc	6	30	12	4	28	29	21	44	13	25	36	35	7	17	14	11	23	9	3	12	13	37	17	31	24	33	25	29	17	31
43	Mollysta	12	12	25	-3	43	33	32	59	20	50	51	52	26	25	44	41	47	23	6	21	26	31	33	52	24	49	53	37	45	50
44	Lolainc	-3	-13	16	-9	24	17	20	36	31	32	16	17	20	9	27	19	32	17	10	-8	29	43	25	26	21	9	18	6	22	17
45	Lolasta	13	26	27	36	28	17	23	30	49	33	38	39	17	21	17	27	34	33	8	22	33	48	37	35	44	28	14	6	13	19
46	Doreeninc	23	26	56	19	44	28	37	41	60	47	49	44	33	27	37	37	40	12	28	33	33	48	44	42	22	24	45	12	44	31
47	Doreensta	14	19	24	33	43	58	29	62	27	55	60	74	36	54	46	62	41	29	11	27	30	54	38	56	10	64	27	45	26	44
48	Greginc	23	-7	20	-18	31	31	33	35	24	39	28	16	28	34	44	31	19	26	14	17	-6	7	10	23	-29	-2	47	17	29	21
49	Gregsta	30	19	40	42	26	39	18	44	13	34	43	39	20	44	27	32	32	39	-4	22	24	37	27	26	16	22	10	6	13	41
50	Christopheri	35	12	52	23	44	20	49	35	30	38	53	38	27	41	60	50	39	46	25	15	34	26	13	20	3	14	31	2	31	11
51	Christophers	10	10	31	29	27	29	47	48	37	37	38	37	28	48	32	44	27	27	22	21	36	41	31	36	11	35	4	20	13	39

Unrotated Factor Matrix

	Factors	
	1	2
SORTS		
1 Claireinc	0.3202	0.3626
2 Clairesta	0.3269	0.2928
3 Rachelinc	0.5287	0.4016
4 Rachelsta	0.2973	0.5873
5 Miainc	0.6640	-0.1215
6 Miasta	0.5434	-0.5113
7 Susaninc	0.5123	0.0154
8 Susansta	0.6791	-0.2457
9 Ritainc	0.5870	0.1168
10 Ritasta	0.7795	-0.1457
11 Dianeinc	0.8278	0.0152
12 Dianesta	0.7450	0.0623

13	Helenainc	0.4862	-0.3238
14	Helenasta	0.5303	-0.2599
15	Charlotteinc	0.6429	-0.2123
16	Charlottesta	0.6938	-0.2589
17	Victoriainc	0.6920	0.1259
18	Victoriasta	0.4791	0.1785
19	Fayeinc	0.2535	-0.0668
20	Fayesta	0.3876	-0.0957
21	Nishainc	0.4170	0.3311
22	Nishasta	0.5829	0.1644
23	Tinainc	0.5188	0.1660
24	Tinasta	0.6656	-0.0736
25	Louiseinc	0.2849	0.5533
26	Louisesta	0.5322	-0.1403
27	Elizabethinc	0.4618	-0.3756
28	Elizabethsta	0.3307	-0.6718
29	Lilyinc	0.5569	-0.2792
30	Lilesta	0.5946	-0.2396
31	Hayleyinc	0.4374	-0.0564
32	Hayleysta	0.2361	0.1549
33	Ruthinc	0.3427	0.1052
34	Ruthsta	0.2216	0.0192
35	Caitlininc	0.4345	0.1099
36	Caitlinsta	0.5369	-0.1807
37	Jackyinc	0.4239	0.3592
38	Jackysta	0.4154	0.2657
39	Grahaminc	0.4936	0.1440
40	Edithinc	0.5613	-0.2351
41	Edithsta	0.5306	-0.4083
42	Mollyinc	0.4057	-0.0988
43	Mollysta	0.6494	-0.2130
44	Lolainc	0.3338	0.1187
45	Lolasta	0.5533	0.4146
46	Doreeninc	0.6833	0.1266
47	Doreensta	0.7329	-0.1231
48	Greginc	0.3628	-0.2156
49	Gregsta	0.5332	0.1656
50	Christopherinc	0.5623	0.0536
51	Christophersta	0.5842	0.1421

Eigenvalues	14.3059	3.5630
% expl.Var.	28	7

Factor Matrix with an X Indicating a Defining Sort

	Loadings	
QSORT	1	2
1 Claireinc	0.0117	0.4836X
2 Clairesta	0.0617	0.4345X
3 Rachelinc	0.1461	0.6476X
4 Rachelsta	-0.1505	0.6408X
5 Miainc	0.5863X	0.3344
6 Miasta	0.7450X	-0.0415
7 Susaninc	0.3821X	0.3416
8 Susansta	0.6778X	0.2491
9 Ritainc	0.3740	0.4672X
10 Ritasta	0.6903X	0.3902
11 Dianeinc	0.6238X	0.5445
12 Dianesta	0.5300X	0.5272
13 Helenainc	0.5805X	0.0651
14 Helenasta	0.5731X	0.1425
15 Charlotteinc	0.6287X	0.2513
16 Charlottesta	0.6976X	0.2485
17 Victoriainc	0.4486	0.5418X
18 Victoriasta	0.2517	0.4450X
19 Fayeinc	0.2370	0.1121
20 Fayesta	0.3583X	0.1762
21 Nishainc	0.1060	0.5217X
22 Nishasta	0.3403	0.5010X
23 Tinainc	0.2902	0.4610X
24 Tinasta	0.5568X	0.3721
25 Louiseinc	-0.1381	0.6068X
26 Louisesta	0.4976X	0.2352
27 Elizabethinc	0.5952X	0.0098
28 Elizabethsta	0.6855X	-0.3012
29 Lilyinc	0.6059X	0.1448
30 Lilysta	0.6093X	0.1994
31 Hayleyinc	0.3710X	0.2384
32 Hayleysta	0.0810	0.2705
33 Ruthinc	0.1945	0.3011X
34 Ruthsta	0.1572	0.1573

35 Caitlininc	0.2618	0.3638X
36 Caitlinsta	0.5272X	0.2073
37 Jackyinc	0.0932	0.5477X
38 Jackysta	0.1469	0.4707X
39 Grahaminc	0.2851	0.4279X
40 Edithinc	0.5809X	0.1814
41 Edithsta	0.6689X	0.0291
42 Mollyinc	0.3741X	0.1856
43 Mollysta	0.6341X	0.2550
44 Lolainc	0.1790	0.3057X
45 Lolasta	0.1566	0.6734X
46 Doreeninc	0.4415	0.5367X
47 Doreensta	0.6402X	0.3776
48 Greginc	0.4165X	0.0685
49 Gregsta	0.3015	0.4700X
50 Christopherin	0.3958	0.4029X
51 Christopherst	0.3556	0.4848X
% expl.Var.	20	15

Factor Q-Sort Values for Each Statement

			Factor Arrays		
No.	Statement	No.		1	2
1	1. Government has good guidelines	1		-1	-1
2	2. There's a continuing reduction in children excluded	2		-2	1
3	3. Focus on children with SEN	3		-1	1
4	4. Focus on disadvantaged	4		-3	-2
5	5. All children considered	5		-3	2
6	6. Language positively influential	6		-2	-1
7	7. SAT's worthwhile for every child	7		-4	-3
8	8. Statementing beneficial	8		2	2
9	9. Inclusion on placement	9		2	3
10	10. Not every child can be included	10		4	-1
11	11. Education of children with SEN suffers	11		3	-1
12	12. Children with SEN hinder the education of the rest of the	12		1	-3
13	13. Not enough resources to include children with SEN	13		-1	1
14	14. Children with SEN can be fully included	14		-4	-2

15	15. Belief in ideological concept	15	0	2
16	16. School system adapts	16	0	0
17	17. Responsibility should be on the government	17	0	1
18	18. Children with mild SEN find it easier	18	3	3
19	19. The school environment is not adequate	19	0	0
20	20. There is a lack of LA support	20	0	0
21	21. There is a lack of school support	21	-2	-2
22	22. Is enough funding	22	-1	-3
23	23. Need more allocated time	23	2	4
24	24. Adequate training	24	0	-2
25	25. Children with SEN have specialist ed	25	-1	0
26	26. Pressure to implement agenda	26	3	3
27	27. Torn between personal and professional positions	27	2	-1
28	28. Moral obligation to implement	28	0	3
29	29. Under-acknowledged by government	29	1	1
30	30. Position influenced by experience	30	3	4
31	31. Position influenced by government	31	-3	1
32	32. I feel part of the process	32	1	2
33	33. P-scale system beneficial	33	1	0
34	34. Flexibility within the agenda	34	-2	-2
35	35. In my opinion to be a 'good teacher' is to achieve in le	35	-5	-5
36	36. In government's opinion to be a 'good teacher' is to ach	36	5	5
37	37. Majority focus	37	2	0
38	38. Solely responsible for success	38	1	0
39	39. Little choice in implementation	39	1	-2
40	40. Suffers occupational stress	40	2	-1
41	41. Enough practical experience	41	1	0
42	42. More emphasis on SAT's	42	4	2
43	43. Focus more on children who achieve 'national average'	43	-1	-3
44	44. Position changed by experience	44	-1	2
45	45. It is necessary to be accountable to external	45	0	1
46	46. If children do not achieve 'national average' failing th	46	-2	-4
47	47. Paramount children achieve academically	47	-2	-4
48	48. Need to categorise children according to their gender et	48	-3	-1

Appendix Eight

Table representing the inclusion agendas factors

Factors	1	2	3
01 I feel that the government's legislation provides me with good guidelines for this initiative	-2	-1	-2
02 I believe that there is a continuing reduction in children who are excluded from obtaining the objectives of this initiative	-1	2	-1
03 I believe that this initiative focusing on children with SEN	2	2	2
04 I believe that this initiative focuses on disadvantaged children	0	1	0
05 I think that all children are considered within this initiative	-1	0	-4
06 I feel that the language used within this initiative positively benefits all of my class	-1	1	-2
07 Statutory assessment tests are worthwhile for every child	-4	-4	-2
08 I believe that the statementing process helps children with SEN within this initiative	3	2	2
09 Inclusion within the context of this initiative focuses upon the placement of children into mainstream schools	2	3	2
10 I do not believe that every child in this initiative can be fully included	1	0	**5**
11 I think that the education of children with SEN suffers within this initiative	1	-1	1
12 I believe that children with SEN hinder the education of the rest of the class	-2	-2	**4**
13 I don't have enough resources to include children with SEN	3	-1	1

14 I believe that children with SEN needs can be included within every aspect of the schooling experience	-2	-2	-4
15 I believe in the ideological concept of this initiative but do not feel that it can be fully implemented practically	3	**4**	3
16 I feel that within this initiative the school system adapts to accommodate children with SEN	-2	1	1
17 I feel that responsibility of this initiative should be placed on the government	2	1	0
18 Children with mild SEN find it easier to be included within this initiative than those with more severe special educational needs	2	**5**	3
19 The school environment is not adequate for the fulfilment of this initiative	2	-1	-1
20 There is a lack of support from the Local Authority to implement this initiative	**4**	0	0
21 There is a lack of support from the school to support me in implementing this initiative	0	-2	-2
22 There is enough funding within the school to implement this initiative	-3	-4	-1
23 I need more allocated time to implement this initiative effectively	3	2	2
24 I believe that I have adequate training in order to effectively	-3	0	-3
25 Children with SEN are seen as needing a specialist education within this initiative	1	0	0
26 I feel pressure to try and fulfil this initiative	0	3	0
27 I feel torn between my personal and professional opinion	0	0	-1
28 I feel a moral obligation to fulfil the objectives	1	3	-2
29 I feel under-acknowledged by the government within this initiative	1	-1	1
30 My position on this initiative is influenced by my	2	3	0

experience			
31 My position on this initiative is influenced by the government's objectives	-1	-2	-2
32 I feel that I am part of the process within implementation of this initiative and therefore I am responsible for its success	1	2	-1
33 The p-scale system is of benefit for children with SEN	-1	1	3
34 I feel that there is too much flexibility within this initiative	0	-2	-1
35 In my opinion to be a 'good teacher' the most important aspect of my job is achieving in the league tables	-5	-5	-5
36 In the government's opinion to be a 'good teacher' is to achieve in the league tables	**4**	**4**	**4**
37 I have to focus my attention on the majority of the class	0	0	3
38 I feel solely responsible for my classes success and failures	-1	2	2
39 I feel that I have little choice with how I implement	0	-1	-1
40 I suffer occupational stress due to the conflicts within this initiative	-1	1	0
41 I feel that I have obtained enough practical experience to achieve the objectives of this initiative	-2	0	0
42 More emphasis is placed on the SATs than any other objective	5	-3	1
43 I should focus more attention on the children who could achieve the 'national average'	-3	-3	1
44 My position on this initiative has changed through practical experience	1	1	-1
45 It is necessary for the school to be accountable to external inspection and the assessment process	0	-1	2
46 I believe that if all my class do not achieve the 'national average' they are failing in their education	-4	-3	-3

47 It is of paramount importance that children achieve academically	-3	-3	-3
48 There is a need to categorise children according to their gender, racial background and if they have a SEN to ascertain their educational need	-2	-2	-3

Appendix Nine

9A – Flexibility of inclusion; teachers' definitions of the inclusion agenda

Ten teachers, who focused inclusion on the placement of children with SEN into mainstream settings, were as follows:

Rachel; Y reception; Low SES; 5 years experience
Mia; Y3 ; Low SES; 8 years experience
Rita; Y6 ; Low SES; 34 years experience
Diane; Y reception; Low SES; 10 years experience
Helena; Y1/2 ; High SES; 1-year experience
Charlotte; Y5/6 ; High SES; 2 years experience
Victoria; Y2; High SES; 27 years experience
Elizabeth; Y6 ; Low SES; 16 years experience
Lily; Y1-6 ; Low SES; 5 years experience
Doreen; Y3 ; High SES; 30 years experience

Seven teachers, who believe inclusion involves the school adapting to accommodate children with special educational needs, were as follows:

Susan; Y5; Low SES; 23 years experience
Ruth; Y reception; Low SES; 2 years experience
Caitlin; Y2; Low SES; 5 years experience
Jacky; Y all; Low SES; 22 years experience
Graham; Y4; High SES; 15 years experience
Lola; Y6; High SES; 10 years experience
Christopher; Y3; High SES; 10 years experience

Five teachers, who believe the standards agenda determines the implementation of the inclusion agenda, were as follows:

Faye; Y3/4; High SES; 10 years experience

Nisha; Y3; 4years experience
Graham; Y4; High SES; 15 years experience
Edith; Y6; Low SES; 10 years experience
Molly; Y5; High SES; 3 years experience

Two teachers believed that inclusion could be effectively implemented, they were as follows:

Claire; Y nursery; Low SES; 13 years experience
Tina; Y5; Low SES; 3 years experience

9B- The inclusion agenda: providing a specialist education for those with more educational need

Twelve teachers, who believed children with SEN have a specialist education, were as follows:

Charlotte; Y5/6; High SES; 2 years experience
Christopher; Y3; High SES; 10 years experience
Claire; nursery; Low SES; 13 years experience
Doreen; Y3; High SES; 30 years experience
Faye; Y3/4; High SES; 10 years experience
Graham; Y4; High SES; 15 years experience
Hayley; Y3; Low SES; 1-year experience
Jacky; Y all; Low SES; 22 years experience
Rachel; reception' Low SES; 5 years experience
Ruth; reception; Low SES; 2 years experience
Tina; Y5; Low SES; 3 years experience
Victoria; Y2; High SES; 27 years experience

Twelve teachers who believed children with SEN do not have a specialist education were as follows:

Caitlin; Y2; Low SES; 5 years experience
Edith; Y4; High SES; 15 years experience
Elizabeth; Y6; Low SES; 16 years experience
Helena; Y1/2; High SES; 1-year experience
Lily; Y1-6; Low SES; 5 years experience
Lola; Y6; High SES; 10 years experience
Louise; Y4; Low SES; 2 years experience
Mia; Y3; Low SES; 8 years experience
Molly; Y5; High SES; 3 years experience
Nisha; Y3; Low SES; 4 years experience
Rita; Y6; Low SES; 34 years experience
Susan; Y5; Low SES; 23 years experience

9C- Child specific variable: teachers' differing positions on inclusion dependant upon a child's SEN

The six teachers who discussed child specific variables were as follows:

Claire; nursery; Low SES; 13 years experience
Diane; reception; Low SES; 10 years experience
Doreen; Y3 to 6; High SES; 30 years experience
Greg; Y4; High SES; 15 years experience
Rachel; reception; Low SES; 5 years experience
Susan; Y5; Low SES; 23 years experience

9D- Re-defining inclusion; teachers' practical notion of the inclusion agenda

The statementing process, teachers included in this analysis were as follows:

Claire; nursery; Low SES; 13 years experience
Diane; reception; Low SES; 10 years experience
Doreen; Y3 to 6; High SES; 30 years experience
Greg; Y4; High SES; 15 years experience

Louise; Y4; Low SES; 2 years experience
Susan; Y5; Low SES; 23 years experience

The p-scale system, teachers included in this analysis were as follows:

Claire; nursery; Low SES; 13 years experience
Louise; Y4; Low SES; 2 years experience
Nisha; Y3 to 2; Low SES; 4 years experience
Susan; Y5; Low SES; 23 years experience

9E- Barriers towards the practical implementation of inclusion

Funding as a barrier towards inclusion was identified by:

Doreen; Y3; High SES; 30 years experience
Elizabeth; Y6; Low SES; 16 years experience
Lily; Y1-6; Low SES; 5 years experience
Lola; Y6; High SES; 10 years experience
Louise; Y4; Low SES; 2 years experience
Mia; Y3; Low SES; 8 years experience
Rita; Y6; Low SES; 34 years experience
Ruth; reception; Low SES; 2 years experience
Victoria; Y2; High SES; 27 years experience

Lack of support from the local authority was identified by:

Charlotte; Y5/6; High SES; 2 years experience
Claire; nursery; Low SES; 13 years experience
Mia; Y 3; Low SES; 8 years experience
Lily; Y1-6; Low SES; 5 years experience
Nisha; Y3; Low SES; 4 years experience
Rachel; reception; Low SES; 5 years experience

A lack of training was identified by:

Claire; nursery; Low SES; 13 years experience
Charlotte; Y 5/6; High SES; 2 years experience
Elizabeth; Y6; Low SES; 16 years experience
Hayley; Y1/2; High SES; 1-year experience
Ruth; reception; Low SES; 2 years experience
Victoria; Y2; High SES; 27 years experience

A lack of resources was identified by:

Diane; Y reception; Low SES; 10 years experience
Faye; Y3/4; High SES; 10 years experience
Helena; Y1/2; High SES; 1-year experience
Victoria; Y2; High SES; 27 years experience

The need for more time was identified by:

Doreen; Y3; High SES; 30 years experience
Hayley; Y3; Low SES; 1-year experience
Helena; Y1/2; High SES; 1-year experience
Lily; Y1-6; Low SES; 5 years experience
Nisha; Y3; Low SES; 4 years experience
Rachel; reception; Low SES; 5 years experience

Support from school was identified by:

Elizabeth; Y6; Low SES; 16 years experience
Greg; Y4; High SES; 15 years experience
Rachel; reception; Low SES; 5 years experience
Rita; Y6; Low SES; 34 years experience
Ruth; reception; Low SES; 2 years experience

9F: The standards agenda and its impact upon the inclusion agenda

Teachers who detailed their position in their reports were as follows:

Elizabeth; Y6; Low SES; 16 years experience
Lola; Y6; High SES; 10 years experience
Mia; Y3; Low SES; 8 years experience
Tina; Y5; Low SES; 3 years experience

Teachers discussing the importance placed on academia in their reports were as follows:

Claire; nursery; Low SES; 13 years experience
Doreen; Y3; High SES; 30 years experience
Edith; Y4; High SES; 15 years experience
Graham; Y4; High SES; 15 years experience
Jacky; Y all; Low SES; 22 years experience

9G: Addressing the needs of the individual versus the whole class; the standards agendas impact on the inclusion agenda

Charlotte; Y5/6; High SES; 2 years experience
Christopher; Y3; High SES; 10 years experience
Doreen; Y3; High SES; 30 years experience
Graham; Y4; High SES; 15 years experience
Mia; Y3; Low SES; 8 years experience
Nisha; Y3; Low SES; 4 years experience
Rachel; reception; Low SES; 5year experience
Tina; Y5; Low SES; 3 years experience

9H: Teachers' positions on the changes that could be made to increase inclusion in their classroom

These teachers within this analysis were as follows:

Claire; nursery; Low SES; 13 years experience
Diane; reception; Low SES; 10 years experience
Doreen; Y3 to 6; High SES; 30 years experience
Greg; Y4; High SES; 15 years experience
Louise; Y4; Low SES; 2 years experience
Nisha; Y3 to 2; Low SES; 4 years experience

Appendix Ten: Table including Q-data from factor analysis process for the standards agenda

Factors	1	2
01 I feel that the government's legislation provides me with good guidelines for this initiative	-1	-1
02 I believe that there is a continuing reduction in children who are excluded from obtaining the objectives of this initiative	-1	0
03 I believe that this initiative focusing on children with SEN	-2	-2
04 I believe that this initiative focuses on disadvantaged children	-3	-3
05 I think that all children are considered within this initiative	-4	2
06 I feel that the language used within this initiative positively benefits all of my class	-1	-1
07 Statutory assessment tests are worthwhile for every child	-4	-4
08 I believe that the statementing process helps children with SEN within this initiative	1	1
09 Inclusion within the context of this initiative focuses upon the placement of children into mainstream schools	0	-1
10 I do not believe that every child in this initiative can be fully included	3	-2
11 I think that the education of children with SEN suffers within this initiative	2	-2
12 I believe that children with SEN hinder the education of the rest of the class	-1	-3
13 I don't have enough resources to include children with SEN	-2	1

14 I believe that children with SEN needs can be included within every aspect of the schooling experience	-3	-1
15 I believe in the ideological concept of this initiative but do not feel that it can be fully implemented practically	-2	-2
16 I feel that within this initiative the school system adapts to accommodate children with SEN	0	0
17 I feel that responsibility of this initiative should be placed on the government	0	0
18 Children with mild SEN find it easier to be included within this initiative than those with more severe special educational needs	2	2
19 The school environment is not adequate for the fulfilment of this initiative	-1	0
20 There is a lack of support from the Local Authority to implement this initiative	-1	1
21 There is a lack of support from the school to support me in implementing this initiative	-3	-2
22 There is enough funding within the school to implement this initiative	0	-2
23 I need more allocated time to implement this initiative effectively	1	4
24 I believe that I have adequate training in order to effectively	1	0
25 Children with SEN are seen as needing a specialist education within this initiative	0	0
26 I feel pressure to try and fulfil this initiative	4	4
27 I feel torn between my personal and professional opinion	2	-1
28 I feel a moral obligation to fulfil the objectives	1	2
29 I feel under-acknowledged by the government within this initiative	2	3
30 My position on this initiative is influenced by my	3	3

experience		
31 My position on this initiative is influenced by the government's objectives	-2	3
32 I feel that I am part of the process within implementation of this initiative and therefore I am responsible for its success	1	3
33 The p-scale system is of benefit for children with SEN	1	-1
34 I feel that there is too much flexibility within this initiative	-2	-3
35 In my opinion to be a 'good teacher' the most important aspect of my job is achieving in the league tables	-5	-5
36 In the government's opinion to be a 'good teacher' is to achieve in the league tables	5	5
37 I have to focus my attention on the majority of the class	2	1
38 I feel solely responsible for my classes success and failures	2	2
39 I feel that I have little choice with how I implement	3	0
40 I suffer occupational stress due to the conflicts within this initiative	3	0
41 I feel that I have obtained enough practical experience to achieve the objectives of this initiative	1	1
42 More emphasis is placed on the SATs than any other objective	**4**	**2**
43 I should focus more attention on the children who could achieve the 'national average'	0	-3
44 My position on this initiative has changed through practical experience	0	1
45 It is necessary for the school to be accountable to external inspection and the assessment process	0	2
46 I believe that if all my class do not achieve the 'national average' they are failing in their education	-2	-4

47 It is of paramount importance that children achieve academically	-1	-1
48 There is a need to categorise children according to their gender, racial background and if they have a SEN to ascertain their educational need	-3	1

Appendix Eleven – The standards agenda

11a- Measuring teachers' success, the tension between the governmental and teachers' perspectives

Teachers who viewed a clear divide between their position and the governments position on the standards agenda were as follows:

Charlotte; Y5/6; High SES; 2 years experience
Claire; nursery; Low SES; 13 years experience
Christopher; Y3; High SES; 10 years experience
Diane; reception; Low SES; 10 years experience
Doreen; Y3; High SES; 30 years experience
Edith; Y4; Low SES; 15 years experience
Greg; Y4; High SES; 15 years experience
Helena; Y1/2; High SES; 1-year experience
Lily; Y1-6; Low SES; 5 years experience
Lola; Y6; High SES; 10 years experience
Louise; Y4; Low SES; 2 years experience
Nisha; y3; Low SES; 4 years experience
Rachel; reception; Low SES; 5 years experience
Rita; Y6; Low SES; 34 years experience
Susan; Y5; Low SES; 23 years experience
Tina; Y5; Low SES; 3 years experience
Victoria; Y2; High SES; 27 years experience

Teachers, who believe the SAT process holds more importance than any other objective, were as follows:

Charlotte; Y5/6; High SES; 2 years experience
Christopher; Y3; High SES; 10 years experience
Diane; reception; Low SES; 10 years experience
Doreen; Y3; High SES; 30 years experience

Edith; Y4; Low SES; 15 years experience
Elizabeth; Y6; Low SES; 16 years experience
Greg; Y4; High SES; 15 years experience
Helena; Y1/2; High SES; 1-year experience
Louise; Y4; Low SES; 2 years experience
Molly; Y5; High SES; 3 years experience
Nisha; Y3; Low SES; 4 years experience
Rachel; reception; Low SES; 5 years experience
Rita; Y6; Low SES; 34 years experience
Susan; Y5; Low SES; 23 years experience
Tina; Y 5; Low SES; 3 years experience
Victoria; Y2; High SES; 27 years experience

11b- The importance placed upon academic study within the education system

Teachers who highlighted the importance placed on academic study:

Charlotte; Y5/6; High SES; 2 years experience
Christopher; Y3; High SES; 10 years experience
Claire; nursery; Low SES; 13 years experience
Diane; reception; Low SES; 10 years experience
Doreen; Y3; High SES; 30 years experience
Elizabeth; Y6; Low SES; 16 years experience
Faye; Y3/4; High SES; 10 years experience
Greg; Y4; High SES; 15 years experience
Jacky; Yall; Low SES; 22 years experience
Louise; Y4; Low SES; 2 years experience
Molly; Y5; High SES; 3 years experience
Rachel; reception; Low SES; 5 years experience
Rita; Y6; Low SES; 34 years experience

Teachers who believe academic importance is of paramount importance were:

Caitlin; Y2; Low SES; 5 years experience
Helena; Y1/2; High SES; 1-year experience
Edith; Y4; Low SES; 15 years experience
Mia; Y3; Low SES; 8 years experience
Nisha; Y3; Low SES; 4 years experience
Victoria; Y2; High SES; 27 years experience

Year specific variable; teachers who discussed differing positions on the standards agenda according to the year they teach were as follows:

Claire; Y nursery; Low SES; 13 years experience
Diane; Y reception; Low SES; 10 years experience
Doreen; Y3 to 6; High SES; 30 years experience
Nisha; Y3 to 2; Low SES; 4 years experience
Susan; Y5; Low SES; 23 years experience

Teachers' disagreement of the use of SATs and the national league tables within the standards agenda

Teachers stated that children who do not achieve the desired national average are not failing their education were:

Caitlin; Y2; Low SES; 5 years experience
Charlotte; Y5/6; High SES; 2 years experience
Claire; nursery; Low SES; 13 years experience
Diane; reception; Low SES; 10 years experience
Doreen; Y3; High SES; 30 years experience
Edith; Y4; Low SES; 15 years experience
Faye; Y3/4; High SES; 10 years experience
Greg; Y4; High SES; 10 years experience
Helena; Y1/2; High SES; 1-year experience
Jacky; Yall; Low SES; 22 years experience
Lola; Y6; High SES; 10 years experience

Louise; Y4; Low SES; 2 years experience
Nisha; Y3; Low SES; 4 years experience
Rachel; reception; Low SES; 5 years experience
Tina; Y5; Low SES; 3 years experience
Victoria; Y2; High SES; 27 years experience

11c- Ofsted inspections; teachers' reflections upon this externalised method of accountability

Claire; nursery; Low SES; 13 years experience
Diane; reception; Low SES; 10 years experience
Doreen; Y3 to 6; High SES; 30 years experience
Greg; Y4; High SES; 15 years experience
Nisha; Y3 to 2; Low SES; 4 years experience
Rachel; reception; Low SES; 5 years experience
Susan; Y5; Low SES; 23 years experience

11d- Teachers' positive reflection of the Early Years Foundation Stage profile (EFYS)/National Curriculum; agreement in the need for a curriculum

Claire; nursery; Low SES; 13 years experience
Diane; reception; Low SES; 10 years experience
Doreen; Y3 to 6; High SES; 30 years experience
Greg; Y4; High SES; 15 years experience
Nisha; Y3 to 2; Low SES; 4 years experience
Rachel; reception; Low SES; 5 years experience

11e- The inclusion agenda within teachers' positions on the standards agenda

Teachers who mentioned that not all children are considered in the standards agenda were:

Caitlin; Y2; Low SES; 5 years experience
Charlotte; Y5/6; High SES; 2 years experience

Doreen; Y3; High SES; 30 years experience
Elizabeth; Y6; Low SES; 16 years experience
Lily; Y1-6; Low SES; 5 years experience
Louise; Y4; Low SES; 2 years experience
Molly; Y5; High SES; 3 years experience
Tina; Y5; Low SES; 3 years experience
Rita; Y6; Low SES; 34 years experience
Susan; Y5; Low SES; 23 years experience

Teacher who mentioned that not every child can be included within this agenda were:

Caitlin; Y2; Low SES; 5 years experience
Charlotte; Y5/6; High SES; 2 years experience
Elizabeth; Y6; Low SES; 16 years experience
Faye; Y3/4; High SES; 10 years experience
Helena; Y1/2; High SES; 1-year experience
Lily; Y1-6; Low SES; 5 years experience
Louise; Y4; Low SES; 2 years experience
Molly; Y5; High SES; 3 years experience
Tina; Y5; Low SES; 3 years experience

Teachers who mentioned that it is not appropriate for all children to be included in SATs were:

Caitlin; Y2; Low SES; 5 years experience
Charlotte; Y5/6; High SES; 2 years experience
Claire; nursery; Low SES; 13 years experience
Diane; reception; Low SES; 10 years experience
Doreen; Y3; High SES; 30 years experience
Edith; Y4; Low SES; 15 years experience
Greg; Y4; High SES; 15 years experience
Lily; Y1-6; Low SES; 5 years experience
Lola; Y6; High SES; 10 years experience
Louise; Y4; Low SES; 2 years experience

Mia; Y3; Low SES; 8 years experience
Molly; Y5; High SES; 3 years experience
Nisha; Y3; Low SES; 4 years experience
Rachel; reception; Low SES; 5 years experience
Rita; Y6; Low SES; 34 years experience
Susan; Y5; Low SES; 23 years experience
Tina; Y5; Low SES; 3 years experience
Victoria; Y2; High SES; 27 years experience

Teachers who mentioned that children with SEN can not be included in every aspect of the standards agenda were:

Charlotte; Y5/6; High SES; 2 years experience
Christopher; Y3; High SES; 10 years experience
Doreen; Y3; High SES; 30 years experience
Edith; Y4; Low SES; 15 years experience
Elizabeth; Y6; Low SES; 16 years experience
Greg; Y4; High SES; 15 years experience
Helena; Y1/2; High SES; 1-year experience
Lily; Y1-6; Low SES; 5 years experience
Molly; Y5; High SES; 3 years experience
Rita; Y6; Low SES; 34 years experience
Victoria; Y2; High SES; 27 years experience

Teachers who believe that the education of children with SEN suffers within the standards agenda were:

Helena; Y1/2; High SES; 1-year experience
Jacky; Y all; Low SES; 22 years experience
Lily; Y1-6; Low SES; 5 years experience
Louise; Y4; Low SES; 2 years experience

Molly; Y5; High SES; 3 years experience
Tina; Y5; Low SES; 3 years experience

Teachers who stated that children with SEN experience differing levels of inclusion within the standards agenda dependant on their impairment were as follows:

Elizabeth; Y6; Low SES; 16 years experience
Greg; Y4; High SES; 10 years experience
Helena; Y1/2; High SES; 1-year experience
Lily; Y1-6; Low SES; 5 years experience
Rita; Y6; Low SES; 34 years experience

Appendix Twelve

Table 4.3- Then combined Q-data factors for both the inclusion and standard agendas

Factors	1	2
01 I feel that the government's legislation provides me with good guidelines for this initiative	-1	-1
02 I believe that there is a continuing reduction in children who are excluded from obtaining the objectives of this initiative	-2	1
03 I believe that this initiative focusing on children with SEN	-1	1
04 I believe that this initiative focuses on disadvantaged children	-3	-2
05 I think that all children are considered within this initiative	-3	2
06 I feel that the language used within this initiative positively benefits all of my class	-2	-1
07 Statutory assessment tests are worthwhile for every child	-4	-3
08 I believe that the statementing process helps children with SEN within this initiative	2	2
09 Inclusion within the context of this initiative focuses upon the placement of children into mainstream schools	2	**3**
10 I do not believe that every child in this initiative can be fully included	**4**	-1
11 I think that the education of children with SEN suffers within this initiative	**3**	-1
12 I believe that children with SEN hinder the education of the rest of the class	-1	-3
13 I don't have enough resources to include children	-1	1

with SEN		
14 I believe that children with SEN needs can be included within every aspect of the schooling experience	-4	-2
15 I believe in the ideological concept of this initiative but do not feel that it can be fully implemented practically	0	2
16 I feel that within this initiative the school system adapts to accommodate children with SEN	0	0
17 I feel that responsibility of this initiative should be placed on the government	0	1
18 Children with mild SEN find it easier to be included within this initiative than those with more severe special educational needs	**3**	**3**
19 The school environment is not adequate for the fulfilment of this initiative	0	0
20 There is a lack of support from the Local Authority to implement this initiative	0	0
21 There is a lack of support from the school to support me in implementing this initiative	-2	-2
22 There is enough funding within the school to implement this initiative	-1	-3
23 I need more allocated time to implement this initiative effectively	2	**4**
24 I believe that I have adequate training in order to effectively	0	-2
25 Children with SEN are seen as needing a specialist education within this initiative	-1	0
26 I feel pressure to try and fulfil this initiative	**3**	**3**
27 I feel torn between my personal and professional opinion	2	-1
28 I feel a moral obligation to fulfil the objectives	0	**3**
29 I feel under-acknowledged by the government within this initiative	1	1

30 My position on this initiative is influenced by my experience	**3**	**4**
31 My position on this initiative is influenced by the government's objectives	-3	1
32 I feel that I am part of the process within implementation of this initiative and therefore I am responsible for its success	1	2
33 The p-scale system is of benefit for children with SEN	1	0
34 I feel that there is too much flexibility within this initiative	-2	-2
35 In my opinion to be a 'good teacher' the most important aspect of my job is achieving in the league tables	-5	-5
36 In the government's opinion to be a 'good teacher' is to achieve in the league tables	**5**	**5**
37 I have to focus my attention on the majority of the class	2	0
38 I feel solely responsible for my classes success and failures	1	0
39 I feel that I have little choice with how I implement	1	-2
40 I suffer occupational stress due to the conflicts within this initiative	2	-1
41 I feel that I have obtained enough practical experience to achieve the objectives of this initiative	1	0
42 More emphasis is placed on the SATs than any other objective	**4**	**2**
43 I should focus more attention on the children who could achieve the 'national average'	-1	-3
44 My position on this initiative has changed through practical experience	-1	2
45 It is necessary for the school to be accountable to external inspection and the assessment process	0	1
46 I believe that if all my class do not achieve the	-2	-4

‘national average’ they are failing in their education		
47 It is of paramount importance that children achieve academically	-2	-4
48 There is a need to categorise children according to their gender, racial background and if they have a SEN to ascertain their educational need	-3	1